THE ISSUES OF LIFE

HENRY
NELSON
WIEMAN

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 20 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BJ 1581 .W53 1930
Wieman, Henry Nelson, 1884-
The issues of life

THE MENDENHALL LECTURES. TWELFTH SERIES
DELIVERED AT De PAUW UNIVERSITY

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
FEB 20 1931
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Issues of Life

HENRY NELSON WIEMAN

THE ABINGDON PRESS
NEW YORK CINCINNATI CHICAGO

Copyright, 1930, by
HENRY NELSON WIEMAN

All rights reserved

Printed in the United States of America

CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE
PREFACE 5
I. GROWING UP........................... 7
II. LIVING TOGETHER..................... 42
III. MAXIMUM ENERGY FOR LIVING......... 69
IV. GOODS OF THE GOOD LIFE.............. 101
V. RELIGION 135
VI. GOD AND THE IDEAL.................. 157
VII. LIFE AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD.......... 179
VIII. PERSONALITY 209
IX. THE LAST DEVOTION................... 238
INDEX 271

PREFACE

THE *Mendenhall* lectures at De Pauw University and the *Taylor* lectures at Yale were both given during the spring of 1930. The present volume is officially the publication of the *Mendenhall* lectures, but a considerable portion of the material of the Yale lectures has been included. The fundamental problem of the Yale lectures, however, the problem of the general theory of value, is not included. It will be published at a later date. It will require more technical treatment than the present work would permit. But anyone who may have heard the *Taylor* lectures at Yale will find much in the following pages which has a familiar sound.

Of all the issues of life there is one that is most important. It is: What is that order of existence and possibility upon which we must depend and to which we must conform, to bring human life to its highest fulfillment and to promote the greatest possible values? This is the supreme issue. While the everyday problems of life are discussed throughout the book, this most important problem is never far away and is squarely faced in the last five chapters.

Academic dignity requires that all use of anecdote and the personal pronoun be rigidly excluded. In Chapter III I have sinned against this high principle.

I am deeply indebted to a number of men with whom I have had profitable discussion during the last two years. I shall not list their names, for it would be a rather long list, but I wish to thank them for their fellowship and valuable helpfulness.

The Christian Century has permitted me to include a few paragraphs from an article published in that journal. I thank the editors of The North American Review for permission to reprint the poem "Domremy," by Mary Lindsley.

CHAPTER I

GROWING UP

By growing up we mean to attain maturity in the conduct of life. That is plainly much more than physiological development. Also it is apparent that many people never grow up in this sense. Perhaps all humanity is still very immature. To attain maturity in the conduct of life means, first, to pass from the urge of life to the art of life; second, to seek not the fulfillment of present desire, but that transformation of desire which will yield most abundant fulfillment; and, third, to live not for the lure of established ideals, but for the lure of unexplored possibilities. To pass from immaturity to maturity is to undergo this threefold transformation. To undergo this change is to grow up in spirit as well as in body.

Growing Up in Our Modern World

There are periods in the history of the world when it is much easier to learn how to live than at other times. The two things which make it difficult are complexity and rapid innovation. When the institutions and customs are few and simple and the social heritage relatively meager and the number of different kinds of individuals, groups, and institutions that interact on one another is not great, it is relatively easy to learn how to live. But when all this is reversed, as it is to-day, when the social heritage is much vaster than it ever was before and the diverse currents of interaction are enormously complicated, the art of life is a difficult art. But even complexity does not make it so hard to learn how to live if the complexity remains relatively unchanged. But if there are radical and swift innovations constantly being introduced, as there are to-day, the attainment to full maturity is further obstructed.

But to say that our time is one in which the art of living is a difficult art is not to say that life is any the less worth the living. On the contrary, difficult art is high art and offers the greatest values to him who can master it. Easy art yields the lesser values. Perhaps full maturity in the world of to-day has more precious values to bestow upon him who can attain it than ever before in the history of the world. That, however, can scarcely be demonstrated. But in any case, the difficulty in growing up in our modern world does not mean that living has any less value.

The present is a time when the art of living must be learned anew by all humanity. There have been times when humanity, generally speaking, knew how to live. That is to say, the established institutions and ideals were adapted to the conditions which then prevailed, so that the developing individual had only to master the way of life which was charted for him by these institutions and ideals. In order to express his own individuality, he had only to assimilate the arts, the knowledge, the vision of his time and in these find the materials, the medium, and the inspiration for his own highest development. Such a time, for example, was the twelfth century in Europe, or the Golden Age in Greece. The individual had only to ascend the mountain of culture which his age had reared and there upon the summit find above him the open sky and all the world at his feet.

But our age is not such a time. There is no mount of vision which the individual can ascend by assimilating his traditional culture. We do not have an integrated and systematized culture. We do not have institutions and ideals which clearly mark out the way of life best fitted to deal with the issues that every man must face in passing from the cradle to the grave in the twentieth century. On the contrary, our world has been transformed so swiftly and radically by machinery and science that the established institutions and ideals are no longer fitted to guide us. We must reconstruct and reinterpret and shape them anew. That is what we mean when we say that the present is a time when mankind must learn anew the lesson of how to live. It is not only that the individual must grow up. Humanity in our twentieth century shows no maturity in the conduct of life. European man has lost his mastery and his sure insight into the way of life and is struggling in a welter of disorganized habits, in a chaos of new and old institutions not adjusted to one another, in a swirl of new methods of achievement and old ideals which do not fit one another. Instead of a mount of vision to climb, the growing individual of to-day finds great heaps of debris left over from other ages and great mounds of raw new earth and stone freshly gathered but not yet put together into a mountain that can be climbed. So the individual clambers over these mounds and hollows and can reach no vantage point from which the earth and sky can be swept in a comprehensive view to guide and inspire him in the conduct of his life. Thus the problem of growing up is not merely a problem for the individual. It is the acute problem of our age.

Of the three parts of growing up, namely, to pass from the blind urge of life to the intelligent art of life, to pass from the striving to fulfill present desire to the striving to transform desire so that it can be fulfilled more abundantly, and, third, to pass from the lure of established ideals to the lure of unexplored possibilities, it is the first of these three which is the one universal requirement of all growing up. Growing up in any age means to pass from the urge to the art of living. The second and the third requirements are not so invariably demanded of all maturity, and the third less than the second.

The second, which is striving to transform desire so that it can be most abundantly fulfilled, rather than seeking to satisfy whatever desires one may happen to have, is demanded of everyone until he achieves the right sort of desires. In some ages, however, the prevalent culture of the time may mold the individual in such a way that he can strive to satisfy his present desires because they are of the sort that yield greatest value when satisfied. But we of our time do not have such a culture, hence our desires are not rightly shaped by the mold in which we grow. Furthermore, if conditions continue to change as rapidly as they have been doing in the recent past, we may never have a culture which will so shape the individual that he does not need constantly to transform his desires in adaptation to changing conditions. So this second requirement, of transforming our desires, is one inescapable function of maturity for to-day, whatever may have been true in other times.

The third requirement is the most difficult of all. Furthermore, it has been least frequently required of maturity. It is that characteristic of maturity which has been most recently thrust to the front. Indeed, it is scarcely recognized to-day to be a requirement of mature living because in the past it has not been so. Many today think it is nothing but foolishness to say that a man must live not under the lure of established beliefs and ideals, but under the lure of unexplored possibilities. "How can that be?" they ask. It is a hard saying.

When it is said that we must learn to live under the lure of unexplored possibilities of value, it is common for the deriding Philistine to speak thus: "Why worry about these unknown possibilities? That's moonshine. To do that is to be an impractical visionary." The answer is clear and simple and ought to be conclusive. To live intelligently in a world as complex and rapidly changing as ours, requires that we constantly solve the problem of how to act in a new situation in such a way as to achieve the best possibilities of value which it may have to offer. These possibilities, prior to their discovery, are necessarily unknown. It is precisely because our world is changing so rapidly, giving rise to new and unprecedented situations, that we must constantly exercise the power of intelligence in solving problems. But to do that means to search and find possibilities which would otherwise not be discovered and which were unknown until discovered. But we cannot search with maximum zeal for such possibilities unless we not only believe they are to be discovered, but feel the lure of these undiscovered possibilities, and so are impelled to throw ourselves into the search for them. Thus the lure of undiscovered possibilities is not impracticable and visionary. It is one indispensable requirement for the exercise of intelligence in the solving of practical problems.

Mr. Babbitt, who does not want to be roused out of his complacent and routine way of living by any thought about undiscovered possibilities, asks: "Why worry about them?" But the exercise of intelligence in modern life is impossible unless we "worry" about that which is not yet known or, if you prefer, unless we respond to the lure of the unknown. It must be a search for possibilities at present unknown because machinery and science, as we have them to-day, are new and have produced a state of affairs very different from anything known in the history of the world. But every new state of affairs gives rise to new possibilities of good and evil. And new possibilities are always unknown possibilities until they are discovered by intelligent search. The only alternative to this is to assume that new possibilities can be brought to light by some other method than that of intelligent investigation.

The first two phases of growing up we shall consider in order. The last, which is passing from the lure of accepted ideals to the lure of unknown possibilities, we shall postpone to the last chapter. This last and highest stage of maturity we call the Last Devotion.

FROM THE URGE TO THE ART OF LIFE

The difference between the urge and the art of life can best be made plain by taking an extreme example of blind urge. The heart can be removed from the body and will still continue to beat if kept in proper fluids. Its beating no longer fulfills a function. It is meaningless and worthless. Nevertheless, the heart keeps on because it is made that way. Or, still again, living tissue has been taken from a chicken and kept alive and growing for seventeen years.

All the lower animals seem to live more or less under the dominance of this blind urge. So also do men in great part. They live because they are wound up to live and have not had time to run down. Theirs not to reason why, theirs but to do and die. They keep on living regardless of any function fulfilled, regardless of any values experienced or anticipated, regardless of any end sought or good achieved. Their living is automatic.

But in this respect there are two most remarkable characteristics about the human being. Perhaps nothing more revolutionary has ever occurred in the history of life upon this planet than the emergence of these two characteristics in human life. These two are, first, that man does sometimes ask the reason why, and, second, does sometimes commit suicide. These two facts about human life mark the great turning point from life as blind urge to life as intelligent art.

No animal will ever commit suicide as long as it never asks the question whether life is worth living. It might still go on living automatically even after having reached the conclusion that life was not worth while; but if it did so, it would be because of the urge of life and not because of the art. If it lives under the control of intelligence, and if intelligence reaches the conclusion that life had better end, then end it will, and that ending will be a part of the art of life.

So we say the appearance upon this planet of a species which commits suicide is one of the most significant and revolutionary events which has ever happened because it indicates that this species is no longer dominated by the senseless urge. It shows that this species demands some rational justification for the continuance of life. It shows that reason at last has climbed to the saddle and is in control. It may be a very faulty reason, subject to disastrous error. But at any rate it marks the end of that senseless, bloody battering of life by which it beats itself to pulp against any stone wall that may present itself. It marks the beginning of intelligent inquiry concerning the meaning and the worth of life. Suicide is not the consummation of the high art of living, but it would be so if life had no meaning and value that could justify the labor and the pain. Suicide shows adolescence rather than maturity. It falls short of what we shall later call the last devotion. But it marks the beginning of the subordination of urge to art and of biological mechanism to intelligent control. It is the ghastly gray that runs before the dawn.

But this new way of life wherein the automatic biological functions are subordinated to reason has scarcely yet emerged. It is more a promise and a hope than it is an accomplished achievement. If we identify humanity with this way of life, then we must say that humanity has not yet arrived. It is still on the way. Humanity is not yet grown up. The animals we call human are just beginning to try to live in this new way. They have not yet learned how to do so. Hence they stagger and blunder and stumble. But surely no one can be surprised at this. For the animal that would be human has lived so briefly on this planet. As compared to the paramœcium or the amœba or the plant spores, or even the reptiles, or, indeed, as compared to most of the other forms of life, man is a merest infant. He has scarcely begun.

This immaturity of the human species is shown by its instability, its chaos and blundering. It is shown by its rebelliousness. It has often been noted that man is the rebel in the universe. He is first defiant and then despairing. But defiance and despair are both marks of immaturity. Even suicide would not indicate despair in a life that was mature. It would simply be a part of the high art. But the animal that would be human is not yet human, except sporadically, emergently, blunderingly, tumbling into the human way of living and then out again. Man's present attempts to be human are analogous to the first attempts of water animals to live on dry land. Any such new venture is frightfully hazardous and takes an enormous toll of life. This new human venture is not so costly in merely biological existence because it is not primarily a biological venture at all. It is a venture into the life of reason. Hence the toll is not so much in biological existence as it is in happiness, peace and zest. The cost appears in the form of boredom, suicide, misery, bitterness, insanity, defiance, despair and all the spiritual maladies. But he who would be discouraged shows in that very discouragement his immaturity. For this human venture, we repeat, is scarcely begun. He who is discouraged is impatient with a childish impatience. He fails to see the far sweep of the centuries through which alone any new way of life is brought into existence.

Thus we find that the problem of growing up is twofold. It is first the problem of bringing the individual to maturity, and second the problem of bringing humanity to maturity. The individual becomes mature by reaching the level of maturity which the present development of the race permits, and by devoting himself to the labor of helping the race achieve its fuller development. The individual that is mature, in so far as the individual can be, will look upon all his fellow men with great tenderness, knowing that they all, himself included, are like children crying in the darkness, having lost their way, or rather, never having found it. For they have ventured out beyond the well-trodden trails of the ancient urge and have not yet established the new trail of reason and of art.

WORSHIPFUL PROBLEM-SOLVING

Achieving maturity is largely a matter of learning how to apply intelligence to the practical conduct of life, and that, in turn, is largely a matter of mastering the method by which problems are solved. The method of solving problems, so far as concerns the bare intellectual technique, has been well analyzed and described by John Dewey and his followers in their various expositions of "reflective thinking." But these expositions leave out the most important part of the whole matter. There are six different requirements for the intelligent solution of the major practical problems of life which these expositions have failed to note, much less give any instruction concerning how to meet them. These six requirements we must briefly mention, for they are aspects of the problem of achieving maturity. One is mature only when he can conduct life in the light of intelligence, and this he can do only when he is able to meet these six requirements needed for the exercise of intelligence in dealing with the more complicated and personal problems of life.

The first of these six requirements which are necessary to solve a practical problem intelligently and which are over and above the purely intellectual technique, is to have that disposition of the total personality which will enable one to acknowledge the difficulty when the intellect is able to find it. The first step in solving a problem, according to the technique of reflective thinking, is to locate the difficulty. But if the difficulty is of such a sort as to excite the deep fear of the individual, he may be incapable of acknowledging it. There will be a subconscious, protective mechanism which will prevent him from acknowledging any difficulty which would arouse a devastating fear within him. So, likewise if the difficulty is of the sort to deflate his conceit, supposing he is greatly conceited, or destroy some other fiercely cherished illusion, or excite his envy to towering proportions or run counter to any deep-rooted prejudice. The most important part, then, in this first step in solving a practical problem, is to acquire that mental attitude in which one is sufficiently free of fear, conceit, prejudice, cherished illusions, envy, and other distorting mental attitudes, to be able to acknowledge the difficulty which the intellect is able to bring to light. Without being thus freed of these ills of the mind no intellectual technique will enable one to locate the trouble.

The second requirement has to do with the way one views the difficulty after it has been found and is acknowledged. One must view it comprehensively and disinterestedly. One must be free of that bias, passion, narrow, specialized interest or other prejudice which distorts the vision and makes reliable judgment impossible. This is a matter of degree, like all the requirements we are here considering. But here, again, it is a matter of becoming as free as possible from those conceits, fears, obsessions, which make it impossible to view the problem comprehensively, and free of distorting bias, after the difficulty has been located.

The third requirement is to be in that state of mind in which one has fullest access to the resources of his own past experience. We all know that in some moods we can draw upon our own past experience for suggestions, and that suggestions flow into the mind much more freely and abundantly at such times than in other moods. To solve a problem we must call up suggestions from our past experience or, as it is popularly called, from our subconscious minds. But we cannot do this effectively unless we are more, instead of less, free of suppressions and, in general, the distorting attitudes mentioned in the two preceding paragraphs.

The fourth requirement is to have that courage, honesty, and disinterestedness without which we cannot follow through rigorously to the end wherever our logic may lead us. When some illuminating suggestion comes to mind as to how to solve the problem, it must be tested by the imaginative exercise of reason, by pursuing its implications and, perhaps, by tentative, overt ventures. But all this requires courage, honesty, disinterestedness. Hence the acquisition of these attitudes is necessary.

The fifth requirement is the enthusiasm, the zeal or drive which will enable us to act upon the tested suggestion and carry it out in the form of practical behavior. We must have some lure which will induce us thus to act. Often this is the greatest difficulty of all in solving the practical problems of life, when the blind urge is subordinated to intelligence. Where can we find a lure to take the place of the old urge?

Last, and perhaps most difficult of all, we must be able to establish those habits, dispositions, and mental attitudes which will enable us to deal with the various factors involved in carrying through successfully to a final issue the course of action upon which we embark. Pre-eminently this is the problem of how to deal with other people, win their co-operation, learn from them, persuade them. We must be win-some, gracious, tactful, meek, yet none the less purposive and unswerving in the pursuit of what our intelligence has revealed to be the right. We must be tolerant, open to the suggestions of others, and yet determined in following the light of reason. How to acquire such an adaptive and constantly reconstructed disposition of personality is the last and greatest test. For without it we cannot achieve the last step involved in solving a practical problem, which is to carry out to fulfillment the required course of action.

These six requirements for the practical conduct of life by solving problems intelligently are so important that we wish here to suggest a further elaboration of the method which, in its purely intellectual side, has been so well described and analyzed in such books as John Dewey's *How We Think,* Burtt's *Principles and Problems of Right Thinking,* McClure's *Introduction to the Logic of Reflection,* and other works.

The further development of the method of solving problems which we here propose we shall call worshipful problem-solving, for it endeavors to meet not only the purely intellectual requirements, but also the moral and spiritual which we have just described and which are equally indispensable, for without them the intellect cannot function effectively to solve practical, major problems which deeply involve the personal interests of the individual.

This method of worshipful problem-solving is designed to meet the six requirements above stated. But there is no simple little formula which will automatically transform a personality in all the six ways mentioned. All we can do is to suggest a method which takes these requirements into consideration along with the purely intellectual requirements. He who is morally and intellectually defective will not suddenly become equipped with all the attributes of intellect and personality needed to solve important problems, by the simple device of giving him the right method. But the right method is always better than the wrong method. We hold that if the method here proposed is faithfully practiced, it will tend to build up the attitudes of personality needed to solve satisfactorily the important problems of life. It is not different from the traditional method described in the books above mentioned, but simply adds to that method further practices designed to build up a state of mind in which the traditional method can function more effectively.

The method we propose consists in taking time periodically to go apart and be alone, in order (1) to survey the activities of life in which one plays some part, and get these in perspective with the highest possibilities they carry; (2) quicken and deepen afresh the propulsion of life by exposing the total personality to the stimulus of sovereign loyalty; (3) after this survey and stimulus, to face some major problem with which life is struggling with a view to calling up into the mind some solving suggestion, or at least establishing some better personal adjustment to the difficulty; (4) examining one's own habits and mental attitudes with a view to reconstructing them so that one can deal with the difficulty in such a way as to serve his major objective and promote the highest possibilities; (5) finally, he will put into words the impelling interest of his life with whatever reconstruction, reinterpretation, and clarification of it may have resulted from this survey and self-examination; (6) this statement of his major objective, incorporating the readjustment of personal attitudes necessary to carry it out and put it into alignment with the highest possibilities, he will repeat a number of times in order to stamp it into his mental processes so deeply that it will continue to function subconsciously when his mind is given to other things.

These several operations in worshipful problem-solving might be named and classified as follows: (1) relaxation, (2) aspiration, (3) facing the problem, (4) self-examination, (5) statement of need, (6) repetition. But one must not think of them as being separate so that one can be done and finished before another begins. Relaxation and aspiration, for example, go together, and it is impossible to say which comes first.

By relaxation we mean that state of mind in which the narrow, specialized, routine preoccupations of the hour are allowed to fall away. Also the passion, envy, prejudice, fear or other tension is allowed to sink into quietude. The importance of getting into this state of mind before trying to solve any major problem we have already noted.

But how can one get into this state of mind? The means by which it is accomplished are our justification for calling this a worshipful method of solving problems. One must relax, yet not in the way one does when he goes to sleep. It must be a relaxation of the suppressions, tensions, and mental conflicts, but at the same time a quickening of the total resources of the whole personality. This is accomplished when one does two things: first, yields himself up to the stimulus of some objective which is not merely of greatest value to himself, but to all other men also, hence an objective of such sort that deep and stirring interest in it drives out the ordinary social jealousies, envies, fears, and prejudices. Second, rest himself upon that order in the process of existence which sustains and promotes the efforts of himself and of all men when they strive to attain the supreme and communal values of life. As we shall see later, these are the two essential attitudes which make up high religion, and when a man deliberately takes time and means to cultivate these attitudes, he is worshiping. Also we have seen these two attitudes are necessary equipment for solving difficult and important problems.

This high objective, to the stimulus of which one yields himself in worship, as well as the order of existence which sustains and promotes all rightful striving to achieve it, may both be very dimly and tentatively defined in the mind of the individual. If he recognizes the narrow limitations of human knowledge and the high fallibility of the human mind, he will almost certainly hold his idea of them in a way that is subject to much correction and development, much clarification and more detailed specification. That there is such an objective and such an order we think few people will doubt when they understand just what is meant. This meaning we shall attempt to develop more fully later on. Here we only wish to say that it is quite possible for a man to rest himself upon this order and yield himself to this objective even when both are very hazily conceived in his own mind. Indeed, we would insist that he whose ideas of this order and this objective are not rather hazy is assuming a degree of knowledge which he does not truly possess and so is falling into serious error.

To do these two things, to yield oneself to the stimulus of the high communal objective of human life and to rest oneself upon the order which sustains and promotes all striving which is directed to its attainment, is what we mean by relaxation and aspiration. It is the first and second step in worshipful problem-solving. Furthermore, we insist that no man has fullest access to the resources of his own experience for solving a difficult problem until he has put himself in this state of mind, for only in this state can he reduce to the minimum those suppressions and mental conflicts which prevent the recall of needed past experience and the ready flow into consciousness of relevant suggestions.

After one has thus prepared himself, he is ready to face the problem, which is the third step in worshipful problem-solving. He must first locate the difficulty, which means that he must discover what needs to be changed or removed in order to attain the end desired. Often the chief difficulty is some characteristic of oneself or other fact which one is psychologically incapable of acknowledging until he has lost his prejudices and self-concerned feelings in devotion to something that is inclusive of the good of all or of a great many besides himself and, best of all, if it is something to which all human life can give itself in devoted service. For the highest fulfillment of human life is found when satisfaction is attained not by seeking satisfaction directly, but in serving a cause which is greater than humanity itself. Devotion to such a cause puts one in a state of mind in which he can view himself and all men objectively, without those tensions and prejudices which distort the judgment and blind the vision. Thus only in such a spirit of devotion is one able to view a problem disinterestedly and comprehensively. Also it is only with such devotion that one can examine himself coolly and calmly, without conceit and without despair or discouragement, but keenly and accurately as he would examine any other tool that is employed in the service of the cause.

The Transformation of Desire

The second phase in growing up, we have said, is to seek primarily for the transformation of desires so that their fulfillment will yield greatest value. Many people write and think, and still greater numbers live, as though the greatest value could be attained by simply bringing to fulfillment the desires we happen to have at any particular time. But a very little thought reveals that, while the satisfaction of some desires may yield the greatest value, the satisfaction of others plainly will not. Hence the first and greatest problem in seeking the major values of life is to have those desires which lead to them. This does not necessarily mean any one single system of desires or any one particular kind of desires. It may be that if we are ever to attain the greatest values, our desires must undergo constant transformation to meet the requirements of a changing world. But in any case, however that may be, desires must be transformed. To recognize this fact, and consequently to make this transformation of desire as important as the striving to fulfill desire, is to become mature. Otherwise stated, the mark of maturity is the rise to dominance of a new desire, namely, the desire to transform desire so that it will meet the requirements of that order which yields the greatest value.

One of the most excellent recent treatments of this matter has been given by Walter Lippmann in his *Preface to Morals.* This statement by Mr. Lippmann is so important and so excellent and has been so widely read that we must examine it with care.

In his portrayal of the theory of high religion Mr. Lippmann presents the ideal of a regenerate and mature personality as the one great end of all living. Self-respect and disinterested observation are made the supreme value and the way to gather whatever flowers there be. As long as we are true to this ideal of a cleansed and mature personality we can look upon the universe "as comedy or high tragedy or just plain farce" and still "affirm that it is what it is, and that the wise man can enjoy it."

In Mr. Lippmann one detects a personality far above the average, a personality too brave and too honest to allow any illusion to cover the truth as he is able to discern it. There is greatness here which should command the respect of all. If we criticize the proposal he makes, it is to point out that Mr. Lippmann as a personality is greater than his theory.

Mr. Lippmann is not a philosophical theorist. He plays his part in the thick of the great achievements of modern life. That is an advantage to him when he undertakes to depict high religion in action as it is lived. But it is a disadvantage when he tries to state the theory of high religion. When he undertakes to state this theory at the end of his book, he becomes a conventional thinker and his greatness has departed. There he merely reports the philosophy of life which has become the vogue in the sophisticated circles in which he moves, so that others who share this conventional view generally say, after reading the last chapter, that it is "strangely convincing." Naturally, since it is the echo of their own thinking.

But when Mr. Lippmann describes high religion as it is lived in the political, the commercial, and the domestic orders of modern life, it is something very different from the meager religion of self-respect to which his theory reduces it. In the practical conduct of life his high religion is the discernment, or the striving to discern, the possibilities of greatest value which the machine and science and industry may afford, and the striving to actualize them. This is very different from cultivating and coddling a mature and regenerate personality by viewing the world as comedy or high tragedy or just plain farce.

Mr. Lippmann's attempt to discern what possibilities of value may be brought forth from the present industrial and commercial order of life has been grossly misunderstood. He has been accused of defending and endeavoring to perpetuate the evils of capitalism. But that is not true. On the contrary, he is trying to discover and actualize what possibilities of value can be developed out of capitalism. If these possibilities which he suggests should be realized, capitalism would no longer be capitalism, unless one means by capitalism huge aggregations of wealth owned by no small group and managed by no inner circle, but administered by the best-trained and talented men in the whole country for the good of all so far as may be. They who condemn and ridicule such a suggestion as Lippmann makes are generally either one or other of two sorts. Either they still cling to those old ideals which we have said do not apply to this new world, or else they have some utopian scheme, which does not represent a possibility of value brought to light by keen observation of the actual processes of the modern world, but, rather, a theory produced by arm-chair speculations concerning the greatest conceivable good.

How can we dedicate ourselves to undiscovered possibilities in such way as, first, to bring them to discernment and, second, to bring them into existence? Lippmann has described the method in masterful fashion. He writes: "When he [who would practice high religion] acted, he would know that he was only testing a hypothesis; and if he failed, he would know that he had made a mistake. He would be quite prepared for the discovery that he might make mistakes, for his intelligence would be disentangled from his hopes. The failure of his experiment could not, therefore, involve the failure of his life, for the aspect of life which implicated his soul would be his understanding of life, and, to the understanding, defeat is no less interesting than victory."[1]

But what is it that this emancipated soul is trying to understand? Is he merely trying to demonstrate his own maturity and rejoice in his own regenerate nature? Or is he trying to bring to light and to actualize whatever possible adjustments of living organisms, meanings, and physical conditions constitute the greatest values? In theory he seems to say it is the first, but in his practical demonstrations he plainly says the latter. Indeed, his high religion is impossible unless he means the latter, for one cannot develop a "cleansed and matured personality" by cultivating it directly and exclusively. If this ideal of his own personality becomes the ruling passion of his life, he will become childish, self-centered, petty, fretful, and cynical. One can only become a mature personality by devoting himself not to his ideals, not even to the ideal of his own maturity, but to the quest of undiscovered values through that method of experimental living so well described by Lippmann.

---

[1] From *Preface to Morals*, by Walter Lippmann. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company.

Thus we come to the third stage in maturity, which means to pass from the lure of ideals to the lure of unexplored possibilities.

FROM IDEALS TO UNEXPLORED POSSIBILITIES

When we discover a possibility of great value, we can devote ourselves to it, but not permanently and irrevocably in a world which is changing as rapidly as ours. In such a changing world the only person who displays maturity is he who recognizes all his ideals to be inadequate, even the ideal of a mature personality, and who gives his life to a search for those possibilities which have not yet been represented by any socially accepted ideal.

This life of search and experimentation can itself be called an ideal, but it is not a final ideal. It is merely a means to the end of finding undiscovered values and making them the goal of endeavor. When these objective possibilities are found and are adequately represented by ideals, such ideals can be taken as our guides, provided the world does not keep on changing so rapidly as to require their constant reconstruction and so an ever-renewed search, not because nothing is ever found, but because something more is ever to be found. A mature personality can live this way. An immature one cannot.

Mr. Lippmann makes plain that this devotion, this quest, and this self-dedication to undiscovered possibilities, searching and finding and searching yet again, is a life that has been lived by the greatest personalities of the past. This experimentation and reconstruction can never safely end because (1) conditions are always changing, thus making old goods obsolete and opening the way to new ones, and (2) because the possibilities of value are presumably infinite and unexhaustible. Furthermore, Mr. Lippmann goes on to explain, this way of living is being forced upon the modern man under conditions which seem to indicate that a greater number will follow it than has ever been the case in the past. At any rate it is more urgently demanded than ever before, and any other way of life becomes increasingly difficult. Any other way of life must perpetuate the present confusion which will surely drift either into slow decline or into catastrophic disaster.

This way of life Mr. Lippmann calls the way of high religion, and he entitles such religion humanism. So it is, according to the theory of it which he presents. But, as we have noted, his practical demonstration of it makes it just the opposite of humanism. Humanism sets up human desires, human hopes and dreams as the supreme guides and masters in seeking the good life. But Mr. Lippmann denies that these can be our guides. In his theory of this religion he does leave one solitary ideal as master over all —the ideal of a regenerate personality. But we have seen how even this is cast out and made impossible in the practical demonstrations of this religion in actual life. There high religion becomes the exact opposite of humanism, for it becomes self-dedication to an objective order of existence and possibility constituting value. This order of existence is unexplored and this order of possibility is undiscovered, but it is sought without regard to our desires, hopes, and dreams. For these latter are childish, when they are set up as standard of value. All life is childish, says Mr. Lippmann, when we try to fashion the value of the world into the likeness of our desires and pre-established ideals, instead of making these conform to that objective order of existence and possibility which constitutes value. Any way of life which glorifies human desire and hope and ideal, and ignores any objective order constituting values which may be very different from such desires and hopes, is the religion of immaturity.[1]

---

[1] This order is not necessarily "pre-established" except in the sense that all possible order, whether determined or indetermined, is eternally what it is. Possibilities change when conditions change, but the determined and indetermined possibilities of any specified set of conditions are always the same. All science implies that assumption.

This searching and experimentation with respect to ideals, which we say is so important for the modern world at the present time, does not mean wild experimentation. To some minds the word "experimentation" suggests that. It does not mean that people should forthwith try experimentally to do whatever happens to come into their heads. On the contrary, experimentation is worthless unless it is planned and controlled in the light of what is known about the matter in question. And every experiment must be carried out only by those people who have the most extensive personal experience with all the factors involved. For example, in the case of modern industry it is quite futile for the armchair theorist to speculate about what specifically should be done, although he may well be justified in insisting that something should be done. But the only people who can seek out and find the genuine possibilities of value which hover over the machine are the men who are actually engaged in industry. They, if they will recognize the inadequacy of our traditional and socially accepted ideals, and will recognize that there are possibilities of value quite unknown to us and quite different from our present desires and hopes, can, by observing this evil and that good, what results from this innovation and that, bring into our lives some of the greater possible values of modern industry. As matter of fact, this is precisely what some of them are doing. One of the most notable examples is W. T. Hapgood.

To prosecute this search it is necessary to react to the value of undiscovered possibilities. This alone can enable the individual to throw himself into an undertaking with a drive and zest which enable him to carry it through to the end, even when he considers it quite likely that it will not yield the specific good that is expected of it and even while every specific ideal is held tentatively, subject to correction in the light of further evidence. He can do this because the source of his enthusiasm is not the specific undertaking alone, but is, rather, those undiscovered values which this specific undertaking may help to bring to light even when it fails, and often most effectively when it does fail, precisely because it is experimental. He who does not recognize the fact of undiscovered values and does not find in them the stimulus to strenuous endeavor will lose his drive when his ideals are held tentatively. But he who is led on by undiscovered values will not experience the ebbing of strong propulsion when his ideals become tentative.

He who does not feel the inspiration of unexplored possibilities must make himself think that his ideal is final and infallible in order to maintain his driving force. He cannot be tentative in his beliefs and projects. He must think the undertaking will unquestionably yield the result expected, in order to maintain his steadfastness. His energy for living depends upon his certainty in specific beliefs and enterprises. He does not like to call this dogmatism, but dogmatism it is. It is a kind of protective dogmatism, protective of his vital energy. This has probably been the chief source of all dogmatism in the history of religion and morals, the dogmatism that has been so obstructive to the increase of the good.

But the hope and courage and enthusiasm of life may be derived from another source than these specific beliefs and undertakings, and so a man be delivered from any dependence upon certainty of belief in such matters. Undiscovered possibilities of value can engender a passionate quest, and so deliver a man from the necessity of protective dogmatism in matters of specific belief and specific practice. They can give to life the cutting edge of a downswung ax and carry him through the failures and the doubts of specific undertakings and tentative beliefs.

These undiscovered possibilities of value are not subject to the errors of human judgment precisely because human judgment has not yet specified them. Hence these possibilities can give an unflagging zest to him who is able to react to them. The zeal of such a one is not abated even when his undertakings seem to fail and even when some critical observer would say his whole life was a failure, as many did say of some of the greatest personalities. The lure which undiscovered values exercise over such men, even when they know these values may be quite alien to their present beliefs and projects, is expressed in such words as these: "Not my will, but thine, be done." "As the heavens are higher than the earth, so are . . . my thoughts than your thoughts." Or, still again: "Though he slay me, yet will I trust him." Such a one can regard every operation as exploratory and every specified ideal and belief as subject to correction without diminishing a fervor that is folly to the eyes of them that know not the lure. The genuine possibilities of value in our age can only be brought to light by exploratory ventures which to many an onlooker will seem to be nothing but failures. But the failure is often that which makes the venture most illuminating.

But how about those beliefs concerning right and wrong that are called Christian, especially the "principles of Jesus" and other accumulated wisdom handed down in the Christian tradition? Do not these impose limits upon the scope and freedom of our search and our experimentation? Others who are not Christian may search and experiment, but we who are Christians have truth, at least so far as concerns the set of beliefs called Christian. So far as they reach we have no justification to experiment if we are truly Christian. That is the claim some make. We do not think it is correct. As already stated, every experiment, if it is to be of any worth at all, must be devised and practiced in the light of all that is known about the matter in question. If the Christian tradition has relevant knowledge bearing upon any problem, then that knowledge has the same status as any other knowledge and should control the search just as any knowledge might. But knowledge in a changing world should stimulate search and experiment, not limit it.

But what advantage is there, then, in being a Christian if we have to keep on searching? The advantage is that in being a Christian one has access to certain insights, clues and suggestions that may help in the search. He has access to certain historic ventures in human living together with the record of what resulted from these ventures. In other words, he has access to data which are relevant and exceedingly important to some of our most vital problems. But does not anyone have access to these same data? No, no one has access to them unless he has not only studied the tradition, but has gotten sufficiently into rapport with the whole movement to discover its significance from the inside. Anyone who does that is a Christian. He may be highly critical of the tradition he has inherited. He may analyze it, discriminating between what is better and what is worse, and use it all to guide him in his search for hidden possibilities of value in our world of machines and industry. Perhaps such a Christan would not be the most unworthy.

But one thing is plain. The possibilities of value in this new world of machinery and science have yet to be explored. Christianity ought not to be an obstruction to the search. It ought to be a help.

CHAPTER II

LIVING TOGETHER

THERE are two ways of living together. One is practiced by all the lower animals. Men also live together in this way. But there is another way in which men can live together, in addition to this way of the lower animals. Let us call the first the low way and the other the high way. The low way is by anticipatory adjustments which are mutually adaptive to one other. The high way is by communication through which meanings are shared. These two ways of associating are radically different, although the difference is rather difficult to put into words. The second kind of association, which we call the high way, is what makes all the difference between the distinctively human and the merely animal way of living. Personality as something peculiar to man is developed out of this high way of living together. Human culture, the progressive accumulation of a social heritage, art, religion, philosophy, science, political and economic organization all develop out of this high way of living together and cannot develop when the low way is the only kind of association which is practiced.

Perhaps the difference between these two ways of living together can best be made plain by an illustration. When an angry man shakes his fist at me, he is making an anticipatory adjustment, which may issue in a fight. He is not necessarily trying to communicate anything to me any more than does a rattlesnake when he sounds his rattle. The clenched fist is an automatic, anticipatory adjustment to trouble when the man is angry, like the growl and bared teeth of a dog. My organism also makes automatic, anticipatory adjustments to the impending attack. Glandular functions are automatically quickened and I may start to run, or I may stand tense and ready, or cast about for a weapon. According as I act one way or another the angry man will do something further to counter my efforts. Thus we make anticipatory adjustments which are mutually adaptive to one another. But there is not necessarily any communication. Of course, between human beings there generally is some communication, but if the interaction were limited to what we have described, there need not be.

But, now, suppose a man shakes his fist at me not in anger, but to serve as a symbol to make me understand that there was a fight here on this street corner yesterday and one man shook his fist at the other in the way which he is now representing by his fist. Here at last we have genuine communication and not merely anticipatory adjustments which are adaptive to one another. The shaken fist when thus used does not quicken the glandular functions of my organism preparatory to flight or defense or attack. I do not stand tense or start to run or cast about for a weapon. There is some mutual adaptation of anticipatory adjustments between us, but they are not the important thing necessarily. They are chiefly practiced merely to serve as symbols, to represent something wholly different from themselves. What we are doing is not merely to make mutual adaptation of organic adjustments, but what we chiefly are doing is to communicate with one another in such a way that we can share a common meaning. This is something quite strange and new and wonderful in the world. It opens up a new way of life with vast possibilities of value which men have scarcely yet begun to explore. It gives rise to community of thought and purpose and to a creative synthesis of ideas.

This new thing called communication enables us to transmit to the next generation what we have acquired in the way of technique, sentiment, vision, ideal, and thus accumulate in history a social heritage which mounts from more to more through successive generations. It is communication by symbols which enables two or more to integrate their thoughts and purposes and thus achieve by creative synthesis a new and wider vision and more profound thought. Thus progress becomes possible, the development of culture, the arts and sciences, religion and philosophy. It makes possible ideals and aspiration and releases imagination from bondage to the immediate situation.

This kind of association achieved by communication can be considered in two ways, first as an association of a few intimate acquaintances who know one another personally. This small personal group finds its highest attainment in the group of two. Then there is the larger group which may be extended to include all mankind in so far as all men can communicate with one another either directly or indirectly or at least are potentially able to communicate. We shall first consider the small group of friends between whom there is personal affection, especially the group of two. Some of the most precious values of life can be found only in that community of heart and mind which two people are able to achieve by communication through many years of intimate association.

Mutual understanding may be of all degrees. Two people may have the most tragic misunderstandings on some points just because they have such a profound mutual understanding in other matters. Two people may share in common more than any other two and yet still have much which they cannot share and concerning which they cannot achieve mutual understanding. However, simply to be aware of misunderstanding or, perhaps we can say, even to have misunderstanding, implies a certain degree of community of mind and is more hopeful than the mutual interactions between a man and a fish where there is not even misunderstanding.

Personal affection represents some of the greatest positive values and some of the greatest negative values. Here, again, we see that the road to greatest worth is also the dangerous road which brings us often into the greatest evils. No anguish is so great as that of misunderstanding and treachery between people who have come to share a great wealth of meaning in common and thus have become peculiarly dependent upon one another and participant in one another's lives.

There are seven great values which every friendship ought to achieve. Every case of personal affection ought to be cultivated in such a way as to bring these values to the maximum.

The first of these we would mention is mutual self-expression and mutual appreciation. The rich possibilities of personality can be developed only when the individual can express himself to another. Many an impulse which might have made a rich contribution to life is suffocated at birth or perverted into an evil because it finds no way of connecting with the process of life. The mutual intimate understanding of two friends provides a process of life in which many delicate and hidden impulses and thoughts can be developed into structures of value. If an individual has no one who understands him intimately and profoundly and to whom he can communicate hopes, suggestions, aspirations, these latter must die for lack of sustenance. It is necessary to have the warm sky and rain of personal affection overarching and fostering the buds and tendrils and delicate flowers of a richly developed personal life. Without such affection a man may develop a high degree of efficiency and power of a sort, but there is a coldness and barrenness about him, an impoverished and mechanical efficiency that excludes the full richness of value which personal life ought to achieve. This full richness can be fostered only through the mutual expression and mutual appreciation which intimate friends provide one another through communication. A child that is reared in a public institution without the hovering love of personal affection surrounding him like an atmosphere, eliciting and nourishing the budding impulses by quick and tender sympathetic understanding, never becomes a fully developed personality. The mature adult also requires this kind of personal understanding between himself and someone else with whom he can communicate intimately if his life is not to be greatly impoverished. This kind of mutual understanding is one of the greatest values of married life for those couples who are able to achieve it. It is a value often ignored, for it is something over and above love as that is ordinarily understood and something other than the rearing of children.

But whether it be in marriage or elsewhere, this kind of friendship is needed if the highest and best possibilities of which an individual is capable are ever to be elicited and developed. If he does not find such a friend, and so misses this mutual self-expression and appreciation, much that he might have been will remain stunted, starved, and maimed. He who has no one with whom he can communicate otherwise inarticulate and undeveloped meanings, falls just so far short of being the personality he might have been, and has missed just that much of the possible richness of life.

There are certain powers and qualities and achievements which find recognition and appreciation in public life. Consequently, these powers and qualities find nourishment and stimulus in public life and are exercised and developed there. But the best part of a good man's life, the hidden motivation, the tender sentiment, the reach that exceeded the grasp, the quick, deep sympathetic insight into the need of another personality—all these most precious powers—will never be developed; on the contrary they will be trampled and crushed to death beneath the feet of the hard, cold world unless that individual has someone who can understand him as none other can understand, someone who can share his heart with an unutterable understanding. "All I had hoped to be, all that men ignored in me" that was I to my best friend. Such a community of heart and mind can be achieved, for it has been achieved, but only if two people live together intimately for many years, each constantly striving to understand the other, drawing upon all the powers of sympathy and insight to achieve it. Such a community of spirit is precious and so vital that it is worth every sacrifice. For of all the rare and high consummations of great living the rarest and the highest is the consummation of such a friendship.

The second value to be achieved by two people living together is integration of visions. Each individual sees things differently from any other. Each discerns qualities and forms and aspects which the other misses because of difference in their interests, aptitudes, meanings. There are beauties which some eyes can catch but others must miss. There are expressions and traits of personality in the world round about which come within the purview of one pair of eyes, but are not accessible to another. There are social movements, there are opportunities of service, there is all the rich world with its infinite manifold of objects and movements and signs and qualities, which no single mind can compass.

Now, if two or more persons can integrate their visions so that each perceives not only what falls within the scope of his own native discernment, but also learns through intimate communication to apprehend what the other has gathered, so that they can pool their findings, then it is plain that each can live in a far richer and more significant world. Then the height and depth and fullness of the world opens up, not only the world that now exists, but the world of ideals and imagination and possibilities.

Every individual has prejudices and obsessions that distort his vision and make him blind to many things. He has fears and envies and conceits that pervert his judgment and lead him astray. But if there is another mind with whom he can communicate concerning these most difficult and delicate and personal matters, the prejudices of the one mind will be corrected by the other. The blindness of the one will be covered by the vision of the other. While each may have envies and conceits, they will not be of the same sort, so will tend to correct one another, provided they appreciate the value of this mutual correction and mutual supplementation and seek it out and cultivate it through all things and cherish it as something very precious and very important for the good of life.

We all know the difference between looking through one eye and looking through two. Through one eye alone the world looks flat. It has no depth, no perspective, no third dimension.

Through two eyes all this is restored. But looking through four eyes instead of through two alone adds even more to the perspective and richness of the world. If I see the mountain from my little valley and the other man from his, we see two aspects of the mountain. I say the mountain has a meadow and a forest and a flock of sheep. The other man may ridicule my statement. No, he says, it is plain as day that the mountain is barren rock with a terrible precipice down the side. To talk about meadow and forest and grazing sheep is pure nonsense. And yet both of us may be right. We simply see different sides of the mountain. And neither of us will ever see the mountain as it is until we see it not only through our own eyes, but also through the eyes of another. Many a quarrel and misunderstanding has no other ground than this. This difference in viewpoint is one of the most precious values that friendship has to offer if we learn to integrate our visions.

3. A third value to be sought and magnified in friendship is mutual self-knowledge. No man can know himself unless he is able to view himself through the eyes of others. That does not mean necessarily that the idea which the other person has of me is correct. It only means that I will never discover my own characteristics unless I note how other people react to me and through this reaction am led to observe certain qualities in myself. I may come to see that the

other person was mistaken, but even in the discovery of the other's mistake, I come to know myself.

Now, this attainment of self-knowledge through association applies to all manner of association. But there is no association that can reach certain levels of the self and bring one to self-knowledge concerning the deeper and most important features of his personality except that of close and long-continued friendship. I may note in the reaction of my friend to me a sign of pain or disgust or fear or dislike. Forthwith I have further light on certain characteristics of myself. All such reactions should be treated purely as sources of information about oneself and about the other and never cause of resentment. They should be treated simply as guides and clues to the organization of a more satisfactory association and to the mutual reconstruction of personality so that the two can live more happily together. Self-knowledge has been said by some to be the matter of greatest importance. It can be attained at the deeper levels only through the long-continued association of two who cultivate a high degree of mutuality in all living.

A fourth value to be sought and found through communication in intimate personal relations is the renewal of zest and courage for living. There come times of discouragement for everyone. It may be due to some bitter disappointment or some misunderstanding. Someone you trusted may have turned against you. It may be due to physiological conditions of illness. But whatever be the cause there are times when the zest for high enterprise ebbs away, when a sense of futility creeps over the mind and the world turns gray. But if in such an hour there is someone to whom you can go and talk it over, someone who understands and who can see all these matters as you see them, from your viewpoint, but also with the supplementary vision of another, then you will find recovery and renewal of spirit. Black despair will scarcely clutch and hold for long if one can talk it out with a friend who understands.

A fifth value to be sought through long-continued association of friends is the glorification of the joys and triumphs of life. Every good thing is multiplied many fold in its goodness if there is someone with whom you can share it. Every triumph takes on splendor when there is someone else who is glad because of your success. The quickening of appreciation and sensitivity to the beauty and goodness of life is the work of communication and that cultivation of the mind which comes from the use of symbols. If we were cut off from communication and were reduced to that kind of association which consists of anticipatory adjustments of the organism in response to signals, the beauty of the world would fade before our eyes, the melody 5 of music would fail and die, the shining structures of far possibilities would sink beneath the horizon. It is communication which releases the imagination, deepens our appreciation, and opens to our experience all the higher values. The kind of communication which two friends are able to develop will add a glamorous and tender light, transfiguring all the world. But this does not come of itself. Two friends must work together to develop such an appreciation and sensitivity, and they must make it a lifelong undertaking of devoted endeavor.

The sixth value to cultivate in personal affection is the transmutation of evil. Grief, sorrow, disappointment, failure, pain are all evils. We do not mean to suggest that these evils cease to be evils when they are experienced by two people who are able to share profoundly all that may befall them. But we do claim that while these are certainly evils, they take on a different quality when they are shared by two who have deep affection for one another. Communication in deep affection has a magic touch which gives to sorrow and pain a kind of blessedness. "Blessed are they that mourn: for they shall be comforted." But what is comfort? Is it not just this deep mutual understanding and sympathy of two or more who can find in their sorrow a deeper level of community? Bitter experience acquires a sweetness, and tragedy a high nobility, and pain may even take on a glory when they are interpreted by communication and become a shared experience.

The last of the seven values of personal affection is co-operative devotion to a common cause. Two can unite their lives in a lifetime's endeavor in such a way as constantly to reinterpret, develop, and magnify the cause to which they are devoted. By communication and development of meanings they can make the purpose of their lives to include more and more of the possibilities of the world so that the effort of the present moment will have the significance and value of far reaches of future attainment. No life can ever experience the greater values if it is limited in its enjoyment to that which happens to exist at the present moment. The present when cut off from the past and future is too trivial and transitory to constitute any great value. Only when the present is integrated as one essential component in a vast structure of achievement which is continued from the past and reaches far into the future, can any great value be experienced. But the development of such a life purpose, at least for the ordinary man, is impossible unless he lives for the sake of others whose interests he shares. By thus identifying himself with the protection and fostering care of a group of loved ones he finds the horizons of his life expanding farther and farther into the future, gathering up more of the heritage of the past, and being filled with a rich fullness of what now exists and of what shall exist in the future.

We have described the seven precious values to be attained by living together in personal affection. But to achieve such a friendship and to experience such values three conditions must be met. First of all, the association must be one that is long-continued and intimate. A few years is not sufficient. Ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty years of association is needed. Indeed, it is impossible for a person to have more than one such friendship in a lifetime if he is going to bring it to highest fulfillment. It is a work of art which requires a life's devotion and to try to achieve two or more of them in a single life is simply to mar each one and to miss the greater values which personal affection can yield.

The second condition to be met is that this association must be one in which the two individuals share together the great problems of life and death. Even a lifetime of association will not yield the values we have described if all the interests which are shared are trivial or are anything less than the greatest problems which human kind must face.

The third requirement is that these two individuals must have some object which is very precious to the both of them, and to which their lives are committed. This knitting together of the two by a common object of love promotes all the values we have described.

Where is it possible to find opportunity for this kind of association in which these three conditions are met? There is only one place in the whole expanse of modern life where it is possible for the ordinary man to have the kind of association we have been describing. We say the ordinary man, because there may be a few exceptions. But omitting these rare exceptions it is impossible for two people to have lifelong and intimate association in which they face together the greatest problems of life and death and where they cherish together objects most precious to both, except in one place, and that is in marriage. In marriage all these conditions are met. In wedlock is the golden opportunity for the kind of association we have described, offering the greatest values of communication that life can give.

We do not mean to suggest that in married life this kind of friendship is always achieved. It may be only very rarely achieved. It may be only one in two or one in ten or one in a hundred marriages that ever succeeds in developing this precious community of mind. The proportion may be less than that. In the nature of the case it is impossible to gather statistics. Therefore it is foolish to try to make any estimate. The cynic who says it is scarcely ever achieved between married people is just as foolish as the glowing optimist who thinks it occurs very frequently. All we can say is that it seems very plain that many fail to attain to it and also equally plain that some succeed. More than that we cannot say. But we can say that marriage provides the opportunity for this sort of friendship.

Marriage provides the opportunity, and for the vast majority of people there is no such opportunity anywhere else in all the world. But such a friendship is exceedingly difficult under any circumstances and therefore it is difficult of attainment in marriage. It is difficult because all things most rare and excellent are difficult. It is difficult, but we believe many people could achieve it if they realized how great and precious were the values to be attained and set themselves earnestly and deliberately to develop such a fellowship as has been described. The reason why most people miss these values is because they never dream that such values of friendship are to be had. Such a thing simply never enters their heads. They seek entirely other values when they marry. They seek and cherish romantic love as that is understood, with its beauty and glamour and tenderness. There are the children and the home and all the social and economic advantages of marriage. All these are sought in marriage. But all these are other and, so far as the value for the individual personality is concerned, all these are less than the values of personal affection through communication when this affection reaches its highest consummation. Because most people probably do not know this, because they do not know there are such values, and do not even dream of them, they do not seek them and consequently do not find them.

What are the difficulties in the way of achieving such a community of life in marriage or anywhere else for that matter? They are legion and we cannot delay to discuss them here. We can only briefly mention a few. There is the complexity of personality which is probably becoming more complex as modern life is complicated. The more complex the personalities the richer may be the values when community is attained, but the greater the complexity the more difficult it becomes to produce such profound and inclusive mutual understanding.

There is the sentimental tradition that in love one must be blind to the faults of the other. This is perfidy, and this sentimental tradition should be rooted out as quickly as possible. It is one of the worst obstructions to the development of most complete mutual understanding.

Finally, there are the fickleness, the uncertainty and the propulsive power of sex attraction, which comes and goes.

It is assumed by many that the one justifiable ground for dissolving a marriage is sexual infidelity. We believe such a claim implies a totally mistaken notion of what is the chief foundation and justification for monogamic marriage. It implies that this basic foundation is the sexual relation. But sex attraction can never be the basis of monogamy. Some few individuals may find it adequate, but the great majority never can. Sex attraction is altogether too unstable and precarious to be the fundamental basis of marriage.

Furthermore, sexual relations have been grotesquely overemphasized and have been given an importance out of all proportion to their due. When man was much more of a beast than he is now, the function of biological reproduction was perhaps the chief thing he had to do in life. The biological reproduction of the species is the relentless requirement imposed upon every kind of animal if it is not to become extinct. But man has long passed the level where mere biological reproduction is the chief requirement for the perpetuation of the species. When it was one very important requirement there was some justification for surrounding the sexual relation with all the importance that it has had. But to-day the emphasis that is given to it is simply a monstrosity and surely cannot long endure.

The moving pictures and light fiction, the popular stories and poems and customs of sentimentalists are not the only causes responsible for this absurd disproportion of emphasis. The energetic Puritans, the professional sustainers of law and order are just as guilty, if not more. The reformers have magnified the importance of sex until the sentimentalists and dilettantes and rebels could not do otherwise but follow in their train.

The ultimate basis and justification of marriage is not sex, it is personal affection. The sooner that is recognized the sooner will some of our present difficulties of married life be surmounted. We do not mean, of course, that sex can be excluded. Sex is an important part of life and always will be and will always have its important place in marriage. We are only suggesting that it has been given a place that is disproportionate to other interests. It has been placed at the forefront and everything else relegated to the background. That is a mistake. It may not be relegated to the background, but it is certainly making the play a burlesque to give it the whole stage, as has been done. Sex is one of the exceedingly valuable ingredients in that community of life which marriage provides. But it is only one. The chief thing is an all-inclusive system of community in personal affection with sex as one component.

Just what are the justifiable grounds for dissolving marriage is a matter into which we cannot here enter. But there is one ground for it which we believe is more important than any other. We can best describe it by giving an instance.

According to a story, which probably makes no pretense of being historically true, Joan of

Arc had a lover in Domremy before she went forth to lead the armies of France. While in the quiet little village, after the visions began to come, but before she had made up her mind to go, her lover is represented as talking to her. He is a simple, good-hearted, affectionate man. But he cannot understand this strange purpose and inspiration which is taking possession of Joan. So he speaks to her thus, calling her Jehanne:

"I said to her: 'Jehanne, the lark gives tongue
On the Burgundians' flower-grown redoubt.
Your eyes are like the tide that ebbs among
The shifting shells, and draws the seaweed out
With soft sighing; and the year is young,
And a long whispering blows the grass about.'
I said, 'Jehanne, the vines and wild weeds creep
About your sabots and your slumbering sheep
Whose silver bells ring merrily and low.'
She said, 'Do you hear trumpets by the Keep?'
And I turned paler; but I answered, 'No.'

"I said, 'Jehanne, the old wives sit all day,
Stooped in their doorways, winding scarlet yarn,
While the brown-footed urchins send the hay
Cascading from the rafters of the barn,
Until their mothers call them from their play,
And kiss the little coats they brush and darn.'
I said: 'Jehanne, enough for you and me,
Sweet milk, bright pewter, peace in Domremy.
That blinding light will soften on your face.'
She said, 'It beats from flames you cannot see.'
And I said, 'No,' but grieved a little space.

"I said: 'Jehanne, ours is a God of love,
Cradling the broken sparrows in his breast.
He dwells in church and cottage. Lamb and dove
Are his; and his the happy bridegroom, blessed
In his fair bride. The candles burn above
Your wreath, awry, and my embroidered vest.'
I said, 'Jehanne—' But lo, Saint Michael spread
His wings between us; bowed his haloed head
In silent benediction over hers;
Yet looked on me with sorrowing eyes. I fled
Down the dim sheep-path to my villagers."[1]

Buddha left his young wife. Jesus and Paul never married, and neither did Saint Francis. There are other things which justify or fail to justify a marriage besides sex. Sex should be given its proper place, not a disproportionate place. Sexual infidelity is not the chief cause for dissolving marriage, but, rather, the cause would be the failure to achieve any community of vision.

THE GREAT SOCIETY

Thus far we have been speaking of living together in the small group, pre-eminently in the group of two or in the home. But that is only half the problem. We must also live together in the great society of economic, political, racial, and religious relations, which, in its utmost reach, includes all mankind. The small group of two and the Great Society are complementary to one another. Furthermore, there are values of communication in the Great Society which have scarcely yet been glimpsed and which perhaps are not even dreamed by most people.

---

[1] Mary Lindsley, in The North American Review. Reprinted by permission.

What the work of communication will do to the Great Society if it is properly directed has been foreseen by some of the great prophetic souls of our history—Jesus, Buddha, Saint Francis, Augustine, and others. But for the most of us, perhaps, this City of God, as Augustine viewed it, or this brotherhood of living things, as Saint Francis discerned it, or this oneness that moves toward elimination of individual desire, as Buddha conceived it, or this kingdom of God, as Jesus called it, this outcome of communication in the Great Society still shines so dim as to seem scarcely more than the shimmer of an illusion. But there is already present in our midst, wrought into the process of existence now going on, an order in which symbols and communication play most conspicuous parts, which must lead on to such a great community if we conform to its requirements.

The possibilities of communication in the Great Society, weaving into a single web all the meanings of life and thus binding all individual lives into one great community, are so little known and so often even ridiculed, because the history of communication upon this planet has been so brief that its possibilities are scarcely recognized. But perhaps all of us in rare mystic moments have sensed what life might be beneath the sun if the lives of all men are woven by communication into a single tissue of life that throbs and thrills as from a central heart.

What is this order of the Great Society, made possible by communication, but still so dimly discerned as yet? It is that structure of existence, brought about through communication, in which the physiological organisms of men, along with their meanings and physical conditions, are so adjusted to one another that each man's whole good and supreme good includes the whole good and supreme good of all, so that each man will find in every other person one necessary constituent and function of that total structure of existence and possibility which constitutes the most precious value for him and for all. Thus each man will be precious to every other as the first-born child is precious to its mother, not because the two are personal friends necessarily —for the circle of our personal friends must always be limited—but because each will know the inescapable fact, that each is to the other as hand is to eye or limb to body, or health to aspiration. Communication, if it is properly developed, must bring forth such a community of life that the meanings which sustain the most precious values for each will become a mockery and illusion unless each personality who participates in the common life is cherished by every other and protected and fostered and enabled to promote and to contribute to the common good, which is his own most precious personal good as well as the good of all, and which he clearly sees to be his own personal good. The outcome of communication, if it is controlled and directed aright, must bring forth a world in which, when men meet, the touch of the hand, the tone of the voice, the glance of the eye, attitude of the body, and impulse of the heart will be expressive of deep regard and profound concern, not because they are personal friends, we repeat —for that often cannot be—but because their highest hopes and most passionate loyalties are knit together inextricably. In such a community brought about by communication men will be more than brothers. Love, however, is scarcely the word to apply, because it suggests that kind of personal affection which can never include a great many people. Good will, perhaps, expresses it better, but good will seems too passive, seems to say merely "Live and let live." But the human fellowship will be more than that when communication has done its proper work. It will be the mutual creativity of a common good, not because each man makes up his mind that he ought to live that way. If we had to wait until each man were willing voluntarily to undertake such a life, the sort of thing we are here discussing would be nothing but a foolish dream. But when communication has done the work that is scarcely yet begun, this mutual creativity of a common good will be something from which the individual will not want to escape, because such escape would incur manifest loss of values so precious and so great. The greatest value for each will necessitate the conservation and increase of value for every individual. Thus will communication weave a web of brotherhood.

In such a community there will doubtless be moral turpitude as black as any, but it will be on a much higher plane than what we now struggle with. The evil in such a time will be as different from our evils as our evils differ from cannibalism and from the social approval of torture as the regular institutional method of punishment.

If communication is practiced in such a way as to weave the lives of all men into a single fabric, the goal which each man seeks and cherishes in all his efforts will be a part of that seamless web which includes the cherished ends of all. Thus each will be able to share in the values of all others and each will share in the ills of others likewise. This interwoven totality of meaning will make accessible to every man in every walk of life some sense of the total meaning of the whole movement of human life. Each will know himself to be a creative contributor and participant in it. Hence each man will find in all his labors and sorrows and joys the meaning of a cosmic movement, lending to the passing days of his little life a dignity and grandeur that will make them worthy of every sacrifice. His joys will never be the mere pleasures of a moment, but will be the splendor of far possibilities and remote historic achievement. This should result from the proper development of communication.

CHAPTER III

MAXIMUM ENERGY FOR LIVING

ALL living requires energy. Living might be defined as transformation of energy into activities of thinking, feeling, and behavior. The more abundantly we live, the more energy is consumed. The more life we pack into a month or a year or into seventy years, the more energy is used. All experience uses up energy. To think, to love, to dream, to rejoice or sorrow or aspire or formulate ideals requires energy. The more we feel, the more rich and full our experiences are, the more energy we must have.

The first drain upon our vital energies is made for the physiological processes—the beating of the heart, the action of the lungs, the work of the stomach, and the movements of the body. The thinking and feeling and planning and hoping that make up our conscious life must take the energy that is left over after the physiological activities have taken what they must have. A simple experiment will prove this. Let a man become so exhausted that he cannot think or feel, so that his consciousness becomes nothing but a dull blur, still he can keep on putting one foot in front of the other to walk, or work his arms up and down on a pump handle. His heart will continue to beat and lungs to function. An expert swimmer can still keep his body afloat even after he is so weary that his mind scarcely thinks or feels. Therefore we must have a surplusage of energy if we are to have that richness and clarity and scope of conscious experience which constitute all the value of life that we are able to appreciate.

How can we increase to the utmost that stream of transforming energy which constitutes life? This problem divides into two parts. There is, first, the biochemical problem and, second, the psychological problem. It is the psychological problem that we shall consider. The biochemical is no less important, but we must leave that to the physiologist and the physician. Certain physiological facts we must acknowledge, however, as the basic sources from which all our vital energies are derived. But after acknowledging these we shall give our attention wholly to the problem of how to release, conserve, focus, and apply this energy in such a way as to get the utmost possible amount of life out of it. This last is a psychological, social, moral, and religious problem.

THE BIOCHEMICAL PROBLEM

There are three physical or biochemical facts about the sources of vital energy which we shall mention and then go on to the psychological problem of how to release and use this energy after it has been made available for life by the biochemical processes.

The first physical fact to note is that all our energy must be gotten from our environment—from the food we eat, the air we breathe, sunlight, etc. There is no "spiritual" source of energy other than this environment. There are spiritual factors, that is, moral, religious, social, involved in the total problem of how to achieve maximum energy for living, as we shall see. But there is no spiritual source of energy which can be a substitute for or a supplement to the food, air, and sunlight. Here, again, a simple experiment will demonstrate the fact. Just remove the oxygen from the immediate environment of the most spiritual person you can discover and in less than half an hour he will not have enough energy to think, aspire, hope, pray, or have any feeling mystic or otherwise. Hence physical conditions are indispensable.

The second fact of this order to note is good health. Other things being equal, the better the health, the more energy for living there will be. But other things are not always equal. Sometimes a sickly person has far more energy of life than a healthy one. You have here a person abounding in good health, and there a person afflicted with much illness; but if this afflicted person meets the psychological conditions we shall later mention which yield maximum energy for living, while the healthy person does not, the sickly person may be more dynamic than the other.

The third biochemical condition of energy is native constitution. Some people are so constituted physiologically that they can transform more swiftly and in greater quantity the raw materials of food, air, and other chemical components into the mental and physical activities of living. This is not primarily a matter of size or health. It has, rather, to do with the way the glands function. The viscera—heart, lungs, stomach, and other vital organs of such a person—have greater capacity for that kind of chemical transformation which is life. Sometimes a very small person will have vastly more energy than a man who is a mountain of flesh and bone. This native capacity for the chemical transformation of life cannot be cultivated or developed. It is the way a person is made physiologically. A Theodore Roosevelt, or a Mussolini, or a Lloyd George is born that way. They can improve their health, as Roosevelt did. Above all, they can cultivate those psychological conditions which make for maximum energy. But the native constitution, so far as we know, cannot be changed. But here again the man who may have huge capacity for this chemical transformation of life may not have nearly so much energy available for living as another man with very limited native capacity if this other man meets the psychological conditions which we are going to consider. If the man with great vitality does not rightly conserve, release, focus, and apply his energies, that richness and fullness of life which might have been his will pass him by while the man with limited native capacity, if he does meet these conditions, will live the more abounding life.

THE PSYCHOLOGICAL PROBLEM

After we have secured the physical environment which is most conducive to maximum energy for living, and have built up our health, and have our native endowment of vitality, we still have the great problem of using these in such a way as to live to the utmost by means of them. The great problem of maximum energy for living has not been solved until we have met these further requirements.

The first of these further requirements is an adequate stimulus. No man has the energy for living the richest life of which he is capable until he has been exposed to the stimulus which can unlock the sluice gates of energy that are in him. Many a man has lived his whole life through and has never discovered his own potential power, never had the great experiences he might have had, nor done the things he might have done, and never even dreamed that it was in him to live in such a magnificent manner, all because he never found the stimulus which could awaken all his powers. One cannot release his utmost resources of energy by mere determination. He cannot do it by gritting his teeth and clenching his fist and resolving that he will. He must have the stimulus that will tap the reservoirs deep within him and reach down pervasively into the cells and the ganglia, the glands and the viscera, where the ultimate dynamos are. Then only will the energy be available for scope and vividness and fullness of life.

When I was a boy we had a cow called Old Blossom. She would not hurt a fly. We children could climb on her back and between her legs. But one time I was gone from home for two weeks and on my return my younger brother met me with his eyes as big as saucers.

"Don't you dare go into the pasture. Old Blossom has a calf, and she'll hook you."

"Aw, who's afraid of Old Blossom," I said. "I'm not afraid of Old Blossom."

I climbed the fence and started toward her. She had her calf beside her, sure enough. As I approached I noticed that she watched me with peculiar intentness, not at all like Old Blossom was wont to do. That made me just a little uncomfortable, but I kept coming. When I got within fifteen or twenty feet, she lowered her horns and started after me. There was a fence about five feet high which I never jumped before or since. But Old Blossom provided the needed stimulus. I cleared that fence with daylight under me.

Horns and hoofs are not the only stimulus which life can provide. An object of love is better. Old Blossom's calf stimulated her energies until her life took on a power and richness, no doubt, that it never had before. But some sort of stimulus everyone must have if he is ever to reach the floodtide of life which his native constitution, health, and environmental conditions make possible. A mere spurt of physiological effort due to threatening horns will serve to show what a stimulus can do, but we must have a stimulus which is more pervasive and continuous and hence will quicken all the powers throughout long stretches of living. If we do not find it, we shall never discover our powers and will never live to that abounding measure that we might.

The stimulation of which we speak must not be confused with excitement. Excitement does not release energy for rich living and great achievement. On the contrary, it consumes energy in mere waste. In excitement one muscle is pulling against the other, one impulse is blocking the other. Energy is used up in inner friction. The power is not delivered to the wheels of achievement and rich and clarified experience. One is merely blocking himself and exhausting his energies in trying to overcome his own self-imposed obstructions.

The stimulation which yields abounding life does not produce excitement and confusion, but, rather, a deep inner peace. The energy of life is not like the stream which dashes against the rocks and foams against the banks, but, rather, like the great river which moves in peace and power to float the ships and turn the wheels. When the proper stimulus is found many impulses are quickened, but they are quickened harmoniously. Each propulsion sustains and promotes the other. Thus the powers of the individual do not obstruct one another, but release and magnify one another. Energy, instead of being consumed in friction, is fulfilled in rich experience and magnitude of accomplishment.

The second requirement for maximum energy is rest. Many a man goes through life without ever discovering the riches of experience and power of achievement which might be his because he is always half worn out. He is never completely rested with all his vitality restored and ready for use. He is always frazzled and nervous. The great art of relaxation and rest must be cultivated until a man can recuperate and regain his bounce and gusto. A man ought to be able to lie down at any time during the day or night to relax for fifteen minutes to half an hour. He need not go to sleep, although if he can, so much the better. But he ought to be able to shut his eyes and lie in complete passivity while the innumerable cells of his body build up again their reduced stores of energy.

To be able thus to relax at any time of need is a high art which may take years to master. Like any other art one can learn it only by practice, but certain things can be done to promote it. For example, the wrong kind of stimulus will destroy the ability to rest. If one relies upon tea or coffee for his stimulus, or any other drug, he cannot rest when he needs it. He is artificially depleting his vital reserves and cannot restore them until the effects of the drug wear off, often leaving some poison which saps further the vital resources. Or if the stimulus produces excitement, rather than a lifelong and pervasive devotion which gathers momentum with the years, his ability to relax will be impaired.

It is often said that Edison, in the days of his prime, slept only four hours in the twenty-four. But his intimate friends knew that was a joke. To be sure, he slept only four consecutive hours, but during all the rest of the twenty, at any time he needed it, he would recline in a big chair or lie flat on his back, close his eyes and take a cat nap for fifteen minutes or so, then up and at it again with restored vigor and driving power. He would do this as many times in the day as he found it helpful. Napoleon also did this but not sufficiently to maintain his powers, for he was losing his grip at the age when he should have been at his best.

Some, as we have noted, have far greater reserves of vital energy than others and so may not feel the need of rest as much as a man of more limited capacity. But if they do not feel the need, it is because they are not living to the utmost of their powers. They may excel others, but they are falling short of what they might attain. And what is far more likely, the people who say they do not need these periods of relaxation simply do not know how incapacitated they are. It is exceedingly easy to flatter and deceive ourselves by making ourselves believe we are not as other men and so do not need the rest they need to keep ourselves at the optimum of our powers.

The third requirement is energy conserving habits. Habits must be organized and established in such a way that the vital energies will be poured down between the conserving banks of these habits and not wasted by spreading out into the swamps and deserts where it will be evaporated or lie in useless puddles or sink into the sand. We must have habits which enable us to throw off those distractions which lead us hither and thither in futile activities which accomplish nothing and get nowhere. How, for example, do we read the newspaper in the morning? The paper must be read. It is dangerous not to read the paper. But the newspaper can consume an enormous amount of time and energy which is wholly wasted unless it is read aright, with habits of mind which conserve and direct the mental processes, the direction of the eyes, the turning of the pages. There are habits of taking recreation, habits of using the automobile, habits of dressing and washing, habits of meeting people and conversing, habits which dissipate energy so that it is not available for living, so that at the end of three-score years one has used up all the energy at his command and yet has never lived beyond the mere borders of life. The rich and throbbing center of life he has never reached, because he never established those habits which would so conserve and direct his energy as to make it yield rich experience and high achievement.

This must be a matter of habit. It cannot be left to free decision in each occasion. The distractions and impulses are too multitudinous and the complexity of life is too vast to treat it by free decision in each case. Also the process of making up the mind is itself a costly use of energy, and in so far as that expenditure can be saved by established habits, energy is conserved for wider experiences. "Take care of your habits when you are young and they will take care of you when you are old:" However, one never becomes old as long as he is reconstructing and developing and perfecting his system of habits. One becomes old only when he ceases to amplify and improve his system of habits. It requires twenty, thirty, forty, fifty years to develop a system of habits which will enable a man to live the abundant and masterful life. If he does not constantly through the first fifty years of his life examine, reconstruct, improve, and multiply the habits that widen, enrich, and direct his experience of life, he will never reach the summit of his powers. That high plateau of mastery and vision which comes in the fifties and sixties will never be his. For some that high plateau extends into the seventies and eighties. Michelson, physicist of the University of Chicago, winner of the Nobel prize, was champion tennis player of the faculty when he was in his seventies. He also painted pictures, played the violin, composed music, and continued his experimental investigations into the speed of light. Only a lifetime given to the progressive organization of a system of habits which conserve and magnify the amount of energy available for rich experience and high achievement could reach three quarters of a century with banners waving in such fashion.

As the world becomes more complex and the distracting lures of life multiply, this need of a protecting and conserving shell of habit becomes increasingly urgent. With the movie on the corner, the colored supplement at my elbow, the glamorous stories in the popular monthly, with the insistent advertisements which lure to every sort of diversion, I shall find myself jumping hither and thither, achieving nothing, experiencing nothing of depth and beauty, simply tearing down with my left hand what my right hand accomplishes, unless I build up a system of habits which conserve and shape my life to fruitful ends. These habits must be not merely of body, but of mind. Indeed, they must be primarily of mind. Without them one cannot do anything with beauty and mastery. He cannot be alert, or good humored, or courteous, unless he has developed the needed habits.

The fourth requirement is co-operative adjustment to the environment. A vast amount of energy is wasted in fuming and fretting over environmental conditions, both physical and social. If the weather does not suit me, I can fret, but the fretting only makes the trouble worse. If the bus does not come when I wait for it, I can stew, but there is nothing gained thereby. The chief problem arises, however, when we come to dealing with other people. We can win their co-operation or their antagonism. We can win the co-operation or antagonism of physical conditions and of animals also. But the stakes at issue are magnified many fold when we come to dealing with persons. Some men are so gifted in winning the co-operation of others that wherever they go their fellows rush forward to pick them up and carry them on their shoulders to whatever high end is in sight.

This grace and winsomeness and capacity for co-operative adjustment to the social environment is partly a matter of native endowment and partly a matter of early training over which the individual may have no control. All that may lie behind him as an asset or liability. But there is much that lies within our powers. We can cultivate and highly develop the art of co-operative adjustment or the reverse.

There are times when we must fight. Perhaps there are times when every man ought to fight. But ninety-nine out of every hundred, perhaps nine hundred and ninety-nine out of every thousand of the fights which we think are altogether holy and righteous and demanded as a matter of honor, would never have been necessary at all if we had not been so cocksure of our own way or so egotistic or so blind to the interests of others, or so lacking in plain courtesy or deficient in any one of a thousand different ways. Every time a fight is fought which could have been avoided without loss of value, there is a great waste of vital energy. For fighting is destructive and wasteful. An unnecessary fight is a luxury altogether too costly. Of course the word "fight" can be used to apply to undertakings which are not wasteful and destructive, but that is not its original and simplest meaning. Even when we win a fight we lose, if the same end or a much better end could have been attained without the fight. Co-operative adjustment to the environment not only serves in most cases to achieve the end, but it is creative and yields still higher and better ends than were anticipated. We won the last Great War, but everyone knows that in that war the victors lost as well as the defeated.

There are two ways of getting through a locked door. One way is to smash it down with an ax. You can get through that way. But you will probably be arrested and may have to pay a fine. You will make enemies and irritate people. The door will have to be repaired. Thus the striving of life toward higher ends will be dragged down and hindered. But there is another way of getting through the door and that is to find the key that will fit the lock. Then you simply insert the key, turn it and the great door, no matter how massive and sheathed with steel, will swing upon its hinges and you can pass through without any of that commotion and irritation and wastage of life.

In dealing with Mr. Jones, no matter how obstructive and truculent he may seem, there is often a key to his heart if I can find it. If I can unlock the door instead of smashing it down, there is something more gained than conservation of energy. Often there is a creative synthesis of energies which is productive of unforeseen riches. There is a myth to the effect that the cave man won his wife by knocking her down with a club. But we have a better way. We use a ring instead of a club. Whether it be committees, institutions, customs, or my lady love, they will drag me down or lift me up according to the way in which I adjust to them. There are two ways of adjusting to them: the way of the ax and the club; the way of the ring and the key.

In childhood and adolescence one often feels it necessary to start a fight merely to show his independence and manliness. One must irritate others and be ostentatiously authoritative in order to demonstrate to himself and to the world that he is not a weakling. He does it because he is not quite sure. In fact, it is the only way he can make himself think he is not a weakling. The man who always insists that he is boss in his own home is having a hard time to make the fact sufficiently evident.

A young friend of mine living twelve miles out from Los Angeles had this art of co-operative adjustment. He received a telephone call from the hospital where his wife was, saying that a baby had just been born to them. He jumped into his little Ford car and drove it as fast as it would go, which was thirty-five miles an hour. Wildly excited he forgot all about the traffic regulations. As he was banging and rattling along a traffic officer rode up behind him, and forced him to stop.

"What do you mean?" said the officer. "Twenty miles is the limit and you are going thirty-five."

But the young man had that way about him.

"Why—why, my wife's in the hospital and we've just had a baby, and I—I—I gotta see her."

"Huh! What's the address?"

The young man gave the address.

"All right," said the officer. "Follow me!"

He started down the street with his siren shrieking until the hills echoed. The traffic opened up before that siren as the Red Sea before the rod of Moses. The way was white and open before him. The young man took the corners on two wheels and the ruts in mid air and reached the hospital in time to get his wife's first smile.

In dealing with a traffic officer it is necessary to practice co-operative adjustment to the environment. In dealing with any human being that is necessary. It is a great art. Success in life probably depends more upon this art than upon anything else. The road is clear and open before him who knows how to win the co-operation of his fellow man. Two men start with the same ability in every other respect or, it may be, one has much less ability except in this one particular. But if this one excels in ability to enter into co-operative adjustment with his environment, the years will find him far on the road to the high places.

LIFE-PURPOSE

The last and most important of the requirements for maximum energy is a life-purpose. If it is rightly cultivated, it provides all the other four requirements which we have mentioned. We have stated what is needed in order to have maximum energy for living, but we have not indicated how these needs can be supplied. How can one get the needed stimulus, the ability to rest, the requisite habits and the art of co-operative adjustment to his environment? These four questions will be answered in describing the way to organize all the activities of a life under a sovereign purpose.

When the activities of a life are organized under the sovereignty of one supreme devotion, each activity supports the others, inner conflict and friction are removed, maximum stimulus is operative, all habits pull together and distractions are excluded, and, if the purpose is of the right sort, co-operative adjustment to the environment is promoted.

If you put one foot in front of the other and then the second foot in front, and do this continuously for hours at a time it is very exhausting. We call it walking, but when we do it that way we are not walking anywhere. There is no organization of activities under a ruling purpose. But if we make exactly the same motions with the purpose of going somewhere to receive a million dollars, we do not become weary nearly so quickly. The toxins of fatigue actually do not accumulate so rapidly in the organism if we walk with a purpose.

When I was a boy of twelve or thirteen I remember walking home from school beneath the blazing sun of a June day, in the afternoon, over a long stretch of hot sandy road without a tree or shade of any sort, after eating an early breakfast and a light lunch and playing hard during each recess and noon. It seemed as though I could not keep myself going unless I fixed my eye on some weed or stick or spot upon the ground not too far in the distance and pretended I was not going any farther than that, and then, when I got there, setting the mark on ahead and playing the same game. But if I should suddenly remember that at home there was a watermelon on ice or a freezer of ice cream, or anything else interesting, but especially if it was something good to eat, my weariness would fall from me like a mantle, and I could walk quite jubilantly all the way.

Working a saw up and down and driving a hammer are wearisome, but if you make those same motions with the purpose of building a little cabin in your summer camp, fatigue does not overtake so soon.

Just as there is increase of energy for living when the simple activities of walking are organized under a ruling purpose, so likewise when all the activities of a whole lifetime are so organized, there is still greater store of vital energy made available. This ruling passion may be very humble, but if the whole life is organized under it, there is maximum energy. Some Bethlehem star to follow and we find our powers released.

It is plain that such a purpose will give us the needed stimulus. But merely to have such a purpose is not sufficient. One must foster it. From time to time he must go apart and be alone and there relax. He must relax in the sense of allowing all the petty and superficial preoccupations to fall away and leave the mind free and naked and fully exposed. These minor matters must engage our time and effort most of the time, for they are the necessary building stones in any large enterprise. But the danger is that we shall become so absorbed in the stones that we shall lose all sense of the building as a whole. It is necessary, therefore, to drop the stones occasionally and withdraw and expose our total personality to the stimulus of the sovereign purpose of our lives. We must yield ourselves to the lift and lure of it until all the currents of our life swing into alignment. If the driving thrust of life is not to fail we must renew our vision of the spires and spaces of that high emprise in which the daily task is but a minor part. Thus life-purpose solves the problem of a stimulus.

It also helps us solve the problem of rest and relaxation. This, we repeat, is an art which for most people must be cultivated with diligent and long-continued practice. But the kind of stimulus we have described gives the sort of inner peace which is conducive to relaxation when it is needed. The many distracting little things which goad and worry and irritate are what destroy the capacity to rest. It is impossible to put these out of mind sufficiently to get our needed rest unless we have access to some vision of a far purpose which gives peace and makes these little matters fall into proper perspective. On every summit there is rest, said Goethe. Most of the time we must struggle through the ravines and underbrush of inconsequential detail. But if we have before us the vision of a calm, high summit and can lift our gaze to it and get the details in proper perspective, we find rest. The organization of detail under the lure of high purpose gives order and peace to the mind and makes it more easy to relax.

Also the habits which conserve energy can be developed only under the control of such a purpose. It is impossible to develop an inclusive system of habits which will keep out wasteful dissipations and distractions and which will canalize the vital stream into a single channel so that rich experience is attained, unless one has some governing purpose that can draw into itself all our activities. But with such a purpose to give him direction and provide a standard one can periodically examine his habits as a mechanic goes over the machinery of an automobile to see what is wrong. He can discover what reconstruction of habits and personal attitudes may be required, and can establish this reconstructed attitude as a motor set by autosuggestion.

We do not mean to suggest that a man will always be able to discover what is wrong with himself or always be able to set it right when he does discover it. There is no possible way by which anyone can suddenly leap to infallibility and absolute perfection. All we can ever hope to do is to make some improvement, and that is all we claim for these suggestions and all anyone has a right to claim for any suggestions.

Co-operative adjustment to environment also depends upon life-purpose, but it must be the right kind of purpose. Some lives are dominated by a major objective that puts them at cross purposes with large sections of their physical, animal, and social environment. Others find an object of supreme devotion which gives them a sense of profound co-operative adjustment to their world. All conflict cannot be abolished. But there are two kinds of conflict. There are instrumental conflict and ultimate conflict. Instrumental conflict is instrumental to a more profound and inclusive co-operation. Ultimate conflict makes co-operation more restricted and more superficial.

There is an ideal order which is already actualized to some degree in existence which yields the most profound and inclusive community and mutual support between all human individuals and between all men and their total environment. That does not mean necessarily that if this order were completely actualized it would reduce everything in the universe to a perfect system of harmony and mutual support. Neither does it mean that it would be a static order. On the contrary, if it is to yield that kind of vivid, variegated, and progressive experience which is essential to the distinctively human way of living, it would have to be an order that in many respects was constantly undergoing reconstruction and development, breaking down at places and being remade. But whatever may be the exact nature of that order, and however restricted or inclusive of all being it may be, it seems to be logically inescapable that there is some order which would constitute the greatest value which human kind can experience when, and if, human beings conformed to it. Furthermore, it seems manifest from the empirical evidence of life that this order must be one of co-operative adjustment between many living organisms, physical conditions, and meanings. Now, conflict which is directed to the end of clearing the way for the establishment of such an order of maximum value is instrumental conflict.

A life-purpose which enables an individual to enter into most profound co-operative adjustment with other individuals and with his world must be a purpose which conforms to the order we have just described. A purpose which does so conform will be essentially inclusive of the greatest good of other men as well as representing the greatest good for the individual who adheres to it. A man who is dominated by such a purpose will find it much easier to cultivate cooperative adjustment to his environment than a man who has a different sort of purpose or none at all. He may lack that native grace and culture that come from birth and early training and in so far as he does lack these it is a great loss. But with a purpose which can be fulfilled only by promoting the ultimate welfare of others, his mood will be shaped and his life molded in such a way as to lead him to many subtle and creative harmonies with the world of men. His very conflicts, if carefully controlled and constantly criticized in the light of his major objective in life, may often lead to wider cooperation and deeper community of life with those whom he is forced for a time to oppose.

Developing Life-Purpose

1. First of all we must find it. We must find what in all the world we most want to do. The mistake many of us make is to assume that we know at the start what we most want to do. As a matter of fact, it is most difficult for an individual to discover what gives him greatest satisfaction. How can I know that I like ice cream if I have never tasted it, or beautiful music if I have never cultivated my ear by listening to it,

or great poetry if I have never disciplined mind and imagination to the point where the beauty of it can dawn upon me? And how can I know that farming is for me the most delightful occupation if I have never had opportunity to practice farming for a time sufficient to apprehend all that it truly involves? And so with any other occupation.

However, when we speak of life-purpose we do not mean merely a profession. A profession is generally just a means. It provides the instruments and opportunities for doing what we want to do. But what gives us greatest joy is not merely playing the part of some profession. It is, rather, accomplishing something of significance for the total movement of human life. If it can likewise be a contribution to something of cosmic significance, so much the more stirring it must be. A man has seventy years to live, and he wants to make the biggest dent he can in that time. How and where can he do it? That is the problem. What kind of striving can give to my life its greatest meaning? It must be something which gives joy to me, for if I practice law or medicine or enter the ministry out of a sense of duty, but without finding any great satisfaction in it myself, I have made a mistake. I may think I am serving the world by sacrificing myself, but I am not, because I cannot do effectively and fruitfully what I do not enjoy doing.

To find that toward which all my activities must aim I shall listen to what others say about myself and about the needs and opportunities of my time. I shall read, I shall observe, I shall ponder these many things in my heart. But one thing I must certainly do. I must give opportunity for the deep, hidden subconscious propulsion of my nature to assert itself and come to consciousness. That is often difficult. How can it be done? By a kind of worshipful, meditative waiting, in which one quietly hearkens until the call of the world and the deepest desire of his own heart merge into a single demand. Waiting before the Highest fosters inarticulate aspiration.

These quiet times are very important. The distractions and cross currents then subside and the deeper urge can rise to the level of consciousness and the total personality recover the single unified thrust of life. The eddies and backwash of superficial conscious projects can be drawn into the central current. Whether one finds his ruling purpose at such a time or not, such seasons of relaxation and aspiration will promote the discovery.

After finding a life-purpose one must foster it. If he does not, he will lose it. It is not likely that he will deliberately renounce it. But in the throng and press of life he will shift a little here and compromise a little there and all the while the drag of the current will be pulling him farther and farther out of his course until at last, after the years have passed, he will find himself far down here when he should be yonder far upstream.

In order to avoid this gradual surrender to the shifting currents of the moment one must dedicate himself anew to the vocation of his choice. He must have seasons when he exposes himself again to the gripping power of his chosen calling. Above all he must occasionally put into clear and definite words just what this is which he is striving above all else in the world to do. What is it that I am trying to do in sixty or seventy years of life? I must be able to state it. This statement of it should change as the years go by, for the purpose ought to grow. It is well to have some formula or ritual by which self-dedication to it is renewed. One might recommit himself to it by some such words as these: Every impulse of flesh, resource of experience, and power of personality is aroused, mobilized, and dedicated to this high calling—then specify as accurately as possible just what it is. This can be repeated over and over several times until it becomes deeply established as a personal attitude. Thus the purpose of a lifetime is fostered.

After fostering it one must guard it from the ills that will surely beset it. One of these is the lure of success and another the lure of wealth, when these two lures can be distinguished at all. Some things bring quick success if they are done well. Other things bring success only after many years of devoted effort. As an athlete or a dancer or a movie actor or almost any kind of an entertainer, one can win great glory in early youth if he is gifted and diligent. But the kinds of work which bring quick success are generally trivial. The more important undertakings of life require many years to bring to fulfillment, and hence success does not begin to show itself until youth is past.

Here, then, is the great temptation. Can you keep true to your chosen work through the years when others pass you by, when quick success comes to those who choose easier ways and more trivial tasks, when your old classmates and associates look back at you with pitying condescension and say: "Well, he's a good fellow. He keeps plugging along. But it's strange how he never seems to get anywhere. But he's a good fellow"—can you hold on through that? That is the test. There will come times when you wonder whether you can hold on. Then comes the crisis. One year, two years, three years, and still the break does not come. Can you hold true to your chosen way of life?

Can one guard the purpose of his life from the lure of quick and cheap success? The way to do that is to have these seasons of worshipful meditation, of relaxation and aspiration and renewed dedication, when the deepest propulsion of my nature is stirred anew and all the currents of my life run strong and deep and steady into the channel of my true vocation. A mere handful of personalities who live such dedicated lives can rule ten thousand, and the ten thousand will never know that they are being ruled. The course of human history is shaped by personalities who can hold to high purpose like that. The far consummations of time are achieved by them. The shifty opportunist and the man who devotes himself to trivial things for the sake of popular acclaim and of wealth that is easily and quickly won, have their reward. Perhaps the great majority will always choose that way and freely confess that they prefer it. Their doom is that they must always live on the superficial surface of life, in the froth and foam, while the deep undercurrents which shape destiny are in the keeping of those who live for the far-reaching and slow-maturing fulfillments. But he who lives for these mighty and slow-moving achievements must have a tenacity which grips to the death and must guard his purpose from the lure of success and wealth until these come and offer themselves to him as he fulfills his true life-purpose.

Furthermore, the purpose of a lifetime must be guarded from the stranglehold of instrumentalities. The means and instruments must not be allowed to thwart the very end for which they are used by becoming so burdensome and numerous that they absorb all the time and energy. As the world becomes more complex and instrumentalities are multiplied this danger increases. A man (or a woman) starts out to make a home. Perhaps that is his chief purpose in life—to make a home as beautiful and as creative of noble personality as can be. But to do that requires many things. He must have a house and lot, if not some acreage. He must have a radio and an automobile and frigidaire. By the time he has gotten all the means and instruments needed to make a home and keeps them furbished and new, he has no time and energy for that community of heart and mind which makes the very substance of a home. Thus the purpose has been throttled by the instrumentalities which were intended to promote it.

I had a roommate in college whose chief purpose was to study, so he gathered all the needed equipment. He procured a large comfortable chair that was thought to be good for study. He got study slippers and a lounging jacket. A book rest was fastened to the arm of the chair to hold the book at the right angle before his eyes. A special lamp was installed and eyeshade, pencils, paper, and revolving bookcase. He would come into the room after the evening meal, take off his coat and put on the jacket, take off his shoes and slip into the slippers, adjust the study lamp, put his book on the book rest, recline in the comfortable chair with his eyeshade over his eyes, and, when everything was perfectly adjusted, he would go to sleep. That is the parable of many a life. So much time is spent in getting ready to live that living is never achieved. The mounting complexities of the world will strangle the purpose of a lifetime if it is not guarded from them.

Finally, one must guard it from fanaticism. To have an absorbing purpose does not necessarily mean to be a fanatic. One becomes a fanatic if, in pursuit of his purpose, he ignores the interests of others, or ignores the conditions which must be met to fulfill it, or does not keep it growing in adaption to changing conditions. These are three forms of fanaticism, and it is a constant danger to him who lives a dedicated life.

This danger also is avoided by the method of occasional retirement for self-examination and review, for meditation and hearkening to the still small voices of experience which are drowned in the rush and hurly-burly of life. These still small voices will save us from fanaticism if we take time to hearken to them. I do not see that wistful, pleading look on someone's face, someone, perhaps, who is very closely associated with me, but whose subtle and inarticulate needs I ignore because I am so absorbed in my own purpose. But in the hour of quiet when I review the experiences of the day and try to sense the movement of all the currents which are shaping my life, and seek to find what is wrong and what needs readjustment, then it is most likely that there will come to me that wistful look and those outstretched pleading hands which I was too busy to observe when the throng and press was upon me. So I am able to mend my ways and modify the focus of my life and thus escape the danger of fanaticism.

In these times also my purpose is able to grow, for these are times of questioning and the gathering of new clues. Thus the danger of a crystallized and rigid purpose is avoided and adaption to changing conditions is made possible. But if I am always driving ahead without taking time for relaxation and reconsideration and seeking out the more subtle and delicate leadings of experience and suggestions for change, I can scarcely escape fanaticism if my purpose is passionate. And my purpose must be passionate if I am to have maximum energy for living.

CHAPTER IV

GOODS OF THE GOOD LIFE

THERE are two possible ways of winning the goods of the good life. One is by accident and the other is by intelligent solving of problems. What comes by accident is beyond our control, hence can be ignored. Thus the only way to achieve the good life which can lay any claim upon our attention is the way of solving practical problems through the exercise of intelligence. There is no other possible way of practicing art or religion or philosophy or anything else which will yield these goods. Nothing but intelligence can procure them. If they come in any other way, it is only by accident.

But the solving of practical problems is not merely a matter of formulating and testing rational theories. The forming and testing of theories is a part; but often the more important part consists in controlling and establishing personal attitudes and habits of body and mind. "Life is more than logic," it is sometimes said, and that statement is sometimes offered as an excuse for resorting to something else than cold intelligence to attain the high values of life. Of course life is more than logic. It is habit and personal attitude, it is metabolism and emotion and much else. But all these activities must be brought under the control of intelligence if we are to enter into the highway of life by any other way than by accident. In the first chapter we described a method by which to apply intelligence to these multiform activities of life.

Solving a practical problem becomes a religious matter when the problem is so important, and we take it so seriously, that in trying to solve it we are forced to take into consideration that which we believe to be the ultimate factor determining our destiny and the most important object for all human living. Thus the most important problems always require religious treatment if they are to be solved aright. The solving of them must be a kind of worshipful problem-solving. The method described in the first chapter is pre-eminently that.

Some of the goods to be sought by this method of solving problems are health, wealth, skill, vision, selective memory, and transmutation of failure. By vision we mean the integration of means and ends. By selective memory we mean the preservation and accumulation of those precious experiences which make life gracious and abounding. Each of these six is worthy of a chapter to itself, and books have been written about every one of them. Every human life must experience all of these in some measure else it cannot be human. He who does not have some health and some of the economic necessities which we call wealth, cannot live at all. The importance of skill and the good of selective memory for a life which would be more than animal will be apparent. Finally, the last great art of living is the art of how to fail.

HEALTH, WEALTH AND SKILL

Health can be attained and maintained only by meeting the physical and physiological conditions such as fresh air, sunlight, wholesome food, sleep, interesting work, recreation in due proportion, and the attention of a good doctor when needed. What, then, has problem-solving got to do with health? Above all, what has religion got to do with it? Nothing at all, many will say. But he who asks such a question has failed to see what is involved in the intelligent solving of a practical problem. It means, among other things, the discovery by use of intelligence, and the establishment by methods intelligently designed, of those habits and attitudes of personality which will enable one to do things which are required to attain the end desired. The end desired in this case is health. We all know far more concerning what we ought to do in order to have good health than we ever put into practice. Furthermore, we never can put what we know into practice with that invariability and completeness which we must do if we are to have the best possible health, unless we have the necessary habits and personal attitudes.

Here is where the method of solving practical problems plays its part. We must be able to examine ourselves, and overhaul our habits in light of the best knowledge we are able to get concerning the requirements of health. We must be able to examine critically our way of living, with the help of a doctor or psychiatrist when necessary. And when we discover what is wrong, we must be able, again with outside help when that is needed, to reconstruct our habits and establish those which are needed. All this is an exceedingly great art, even when a doctor lends his assistance. We have described in the first chapter a method which we believe is helpful to this end.

The various values of life go together, and what is conducive to one is often helpful to another. He who practices co-operative adjustment with his intimate associates and with the larger group, and who establishes and guards a worthy life-purpose with the organization of all activities and with the peace of mind which that gives, will have much to help him in developing those habits which make for the basic value of health. But the solution of the problem of health consists in establishing those habits which are conducive to health; and the establishment of such habits is a kind of problem-solving.

Wealth is the second of the goods we are considering. Wealth in any quantity sufficient for the free and satisfactory conduct of life is rarely gotten by the simple method of being faithful and diligent and serviceable. Economic goods, which are wealth, are to-day produced by a vast and enormously complicated system of activities which includes machinery as one of its most important components along with human labor and management. This complicated industrial and financial system transforms the raw materials of nature into the utilities we call wealth and is able to turn out enormous quantities of goods chiefly because of the mechanical inventions of science during the last fifty years. This vast system has many spigots through which the wealth it produces is poured out in the form of wages or salaries or commissions or profits. Now, the way an individual obtains wealth in a world dominated by this impersonal and mechanical system of production is not primarily by rendering good service, but it is by getting under one of these spigots through which the golden stream is poured. Of course a business is not likely to prosper unless it renders good service. But that is not the point we are making. Our point is that the individual man who derives the greatest wealth from that business is not necessarily he who renders the most service in it; but it is he who is located in that financially strategic position where he can hold his bag under the biggest stream of wealth which the business pours forth.

Men who acquire great wealth may be of great service to society, but their wealth does not come to them because of the service they render. It comes to them because, either by accident or by their own maneuvers, they get under the right spigot. Sometimes accident throws a man under the golden stream and he could not escape it if he tried, although it generally requires a good deal of scheming to stay there when others are fighting to reach the same place. But whether it be due to accident or to clever scheming or to both, this is the way all great wealth is obtained in our modern world of vast impersonal organization where the economic system works like a huge machine. He who stands under the spigot gets the wealth regardless of anything else he may do. Furthermore, this is not due to anything peculiar to the system of capitalism. On the contrary, it seems rather to indicate the decline of capitalism if by capitalism is meant the constructive upbuilding of the economic system by private enterprise. There was a time when the "captain of industry" could render great service in building up the structure of the industrial order of production through the exercise of free initiative. But that time is past. Now wealth is obtained by controlling investments and financial organization, and these are by no means identical with promoting the efficiency and scope of industrial production and distribution of goods. This decline in the value of the service rendered to economic production by private enterprise is a decline in the most important value which capitalism has to offer.

But if capitalism should be suddenly or gradually supplanted and any other kind of economic order now being proposed should rise in its place, the spigot method of getting wealth would still prevail. The amount of wealth which any individual could obtain might be greatly limited, but whatever wealth came his way would be due to the fact that he held some strategic position where the economic system debouched its store. We do not even mean to suggest that this disjunction between service rendered and wealth obtained is a bad thing. We are not at all convinced that the best inducement to the most valuable service is the wealth which such service may offer. Therefore this disjunction, which makes wealth no longer the necessary outcome and measure of important service rendered, may be the very condition under which other inducements to high achievement will have an opportunity to show themselves in many occupations. The old tradition still dominates the minds of many people that service rendered and wealth acquired go together, and as long as this childish illusion prevails, the full significance of the disjunction we have been describing will not be noted and its rightful psychological effect will not occur. But the illusion will probably pass in time, and when it does, the psychological effects of this separation between service rendered and wealth acquired may be much better than if the two were united.

But since there is this separation between wealth and significant and interesting achievement, they who are intelligent enough to see it must plan their lives accordingly. Since wealth does not regularly come as the reward and inevitable outcome of important constructive achievement, it is impossible for a man to devote himself with single mind to his work, as though the economic question would take care of itself. It will not take care of itself. Therefore the man who engages in work which is worthy of high devotion must do two things. He must, first, devote himself to his work and bring it to the highest fulfillment possible. Then, in the second place, he must do something else quite different, and he must not deceive himself into thinking the two are the same. This second thing he must do is to maneuver himself and his work in such a way that he will never be beyond the reach of one of the sizable spigots from which the economic necessities are procured.

In making the above statement we are assuming that the mere striving to get under one of the spigots and stay there is not significant work, and he who makes that his chief interest is not doing anything which is worthy of high devotion. Doubtless, there will always be many people who will make this the chief preoccupation of all their days just as there will always be many people who waste their lives on all manner of foolish and trivial matters. As a matter of fact, people who make it their chief business in life to get their bag under the biggest spigot and keep it there, display serious psychological maladies which are quite conspicuous in modern life. But the merits and demerits of such a way of life lie outside the scope of our present consideration, just as do the merits and demerits of a life of thievery, murder, prostitution, and many other preoccupations of man.

We are assuming that a man follows some calling which is interesting, important, and satisfying, and are asserting that if he does, he cannot assume that it will yield adequate financial reward. Therefore anyone who lives such a life must solve a double problem: first, the problem of promoting his work, and, second, the problem of securing the needed wealth. The two do not become identical, as some often think.

So we conclude there are two kinds of fools in this matter of wealth, and which is worse it is hard to say. The first fool is he who thinks that because he is making money legitimately he therefore is rendering worthy service or doing important work. The conclusion does not necessarily follow at all. The second kind of fool is he who thinks that because he is giving his life to noble work he therefore does not need to think about such mundane matters as wealth. On the contrary, precisely because his chosen work is not automatically remunerative he must give all the more attention to the financial problem. He must discipline his mind and his every impulse so that he can do his work and at the same time procure the economic necessities. It is a matter of developing requisite habits and mental attitudes by the method described in the first chapter. He who trusts to the ravens is assuming a kind of piety which merely serves as a cloak to conceal his own self-indulgence in refusing to subject himself to the self-discipline and energetic action which are necessary if a man is going to do significant work and at the same time procure the needed wealth. To combine these two is a difficult achievement, yet either one of these two without the other falls short of the good life.

The third component of any good life is skill. Every man must have some particular kind of work in which he has a sense of mastery, else he has missed the high fulfillment of life. This mastery may be in some very humble kind of activity. How lowly it be is not important, but it is important that there be high art and mastery in the doing of it. The man who comes around the block once a month with a grindstone and a bell to sharpen knives and axes has the needed skill. He takes pride in his ability to sharpen steel and his life is triumphant in consequence. A young chauffeur at the front in the Great War had to drive a car at great speed under all manner of conditions. But he was an expert and he knew it. "I can hold her nose to the road," he said, "at ninety miles an hour, good roads or bad, daylight or dark, rain or shine." And there was the ditch digger of whom John Hays wrote:

> "I'll dig a ditch so straight and true
> Almighty God can look it through."

There are health, wealth, and skill, but the greatest of these is skill. If a man had to choose between having, on the one hand, abounding health and great wealth, but without ability to do anything with skill and so unable to respect himself or command the respect of others, or, on the other hand, superb mastery in some chosen work, but with poor health and poverty, the latter would be the better choice. But all three are needed and should be sought by every resource that art, science, religion, and philosophy may provide.

VISION

The fourth problem to be solved, if the good life is to be attained, is the integration of means and ends. A means is sometimes called an instrumental experience, while an end is a consummatory experience. Or the two may be distinguished by calling the one extrinsic value and the other intrinsic, or the first mediate value and the other immediate. We shall use the terms "instrumental" and "consummatory" or else simply "means" and "ends."

One reason this is such an important problem is that the instrumental process is so often a disvalue. In order to attain some good we must do something that is disagreeable. I work that I may eat. Eating is the consummatory value; working has instrumental value only, or at least that seems to be the implication of the old adage, "He who eats must work." The working is painful or monotonous or in some way is an evil that must be endured for the sake of the good to follow. The experience of the dentist's chair must be endured for the sake of consequent health and comfort.

As long as consummatory values can be increased only by means of instrumentalities that are nasty and evil, the question is always pertinent whether the net result is really an increase of good; and in any case there is always the price to be paid which must be subtracted from the good of the end attained. As long as the instrumentalities of life hold this status, life is always a problem of the bargain counter. How much evil shall I pay for how much good? The bargain is often a doubtful one.

In the light of this contrast between the instrumental and consummatory we may say that one of the supreme problems in the increase of good is the problem of how to make instrumental processes consummatory while at the same time retaining their instrumental efficiency. It is also the problem of how to make consummatory experiences instrumental without any loss of their consummatory value. In other words, we cannot hope to increase the good of life very much unless we are able to integrate the instrumental and the consummatory in such a way that we can find our great positive value of experience in instrumental process itself; and also find in great consummatory experience that which is productive of further good on beyond itself. This unification of the instrumental and the consummatory into one experience is the great problem.

To be able to distinguish between means and ends and to detach one from the other is a great gain in some respects. It enables us to experiment, to devise tools deliberately as well as other instrumentalities, to recognize that there may be undiscovered possibilities and possibilities that have never yet been actualized. Also it enables us to force ourselves to do what we otherwise would not want to do for the sake of ultimate ends to be attained. It enables us to act contrary to what we call the "natural impulse," to discipline ourselves, to suppress the impulse aroused by the immediate good for the sake of a more remote good. All this we do not find among the lower animals to any marked degree. Neither do we find it among men except where men have mastered symbolized meaning and have brought all their lives under the control of such symbols. Animals, children, primitive people do not do that which is painful or disagreeable unless they are driven to it by fear of greater ill in the very near future. The remote future can shape their lives only when by means of symbols they are able to represent it so that they feel its importance along with the present. It is only when symbols illuminate the far-off goods and ills that we can work for them and for the sake of them undergo long, laborious, and painful processes that are purely instrumental.

Plainly, this foresight—this planning and working for the future—has its advantages, but it also has its evil. Its evil arises when there is disjunction between the means and ends. The evil consists in undergoing long, disagreeable instrumental processes for the sake of consummatory ends that are unproductive and transitory. The end is enjoyable, but the means is not. Often the disjunction is so extreme that the end cannot be enjoyed unless the means is carefully and completely excluded from all share in it; and the means cannot be efficiently accomplished unless all enjoyment of the end is excluded from it. Much menial labor is of this sort. Often people who prepare the food are not the ones who enjoy it. The people who prepare, as well as all instruments and materials of the preparation, are kept in the kitchen, while the people who enjoy it stay in the dining room and move in a wholly different sphere. Thus two wholly different and mutually exclusive worlds are developed—the world of consummatory values and the world of instrumental values.

We do not mean to suggest that the people who prepare the food never have any consummatory experiences nor that the people who enjoy it never do anything instrumental, although both these extremes are sometimes approached. Our only point is that this bifurcation of the world into the mutual exclusiveness of instrumental and consummatory is a fact and constitutes one of the most serious problems.

How can this bifurcation be overcome or its evil reduced? It must be overcome by the use of symbols. Symbols have created the evil and symbols must be used to cure it. Symbols can be used and must be used to make the instrumental processes of life yield satisfaction in themselves; and also make the consummatory experiences productive of further values. This is accomplished when organic attitudes, meanings, and physical conditions are adjusted to one another in such a way that the instrumental process becomes a part of the end that is sought, and the end is just that totality which includes the means as one of its essential constituents. The means is then that part of the totality called the end which happens to lend itself most readily to our control. We call it the means simply because it is that part of the end which is most accessible and controllable. It is, as it were, the handle by which we grasp the end. Thus a woman may work to keep her home in order, but in this work find one of the chief ways of enjoying the home. A parent may labor to care for a child, but in this labor find the chief way to enter into the consummatory experience of parenthood. The labor is not a means which, while being performed, excludes the enjoyment of the end, but it is, rather, the way the end is enjoyed. A man may read and study as a means to his education, but this reading and study may also be the way in which he experiences the value of the education. Jacob could serve seven years for the hand of Rachel, and they seemed to him but a few days for the love he bore her. The labor was itself the experience of love.

Thus we have two kinds of means and ends, or two ways in which means and ends may be related. In the one case means and ends are mutually exclusive. In the other case they constitute a single totality. In the one case the means cannot be efficient nor the end enjoyable unless the two are kept apart. In the other case there can be neither efficiency nor enjoyment unless the two are integrated. The problem of the good life cannot be solved until we make this integration of means and ends to prevail more and more.

One of the first and most important steps in this integration of means and ends is the elimination of that kind of consummatory experience which is wholly nonproductive, which merely consumes what has been produced without producing anything of value. As long as we seek such ends there can be no integration of means and ends. As long as we prize that kind of enjoyment which merely burns up what has been laboriously and patiently produced, but produces nothing to take its place, the problem cannot be solved.

Our enjoyment will be productive and instrumental as well as consummatory when we learn to appreciate those great but difficult values which consist in structures of far-reaching possibility. When the joy of the present moment arises out of meaning, and when that meaning consists in the construction and control of possibilities yet to be achieved, it is plain that such a joy is productive and instrumental as well as consummatory. It is also plain that such a joy cannot consist in burning up what has been produced without putting something else of value in its place, because in such joy the future must be taken into consideration. To enjoy the unproductive moment, attention must be given to the immediate and transitory present and be turned away from the construction and control of possibilities. But when the joy of the present moment is due to the apprehension of far possibilities which are promoted by what we are now doing, then present experience shares the joy of remote consummations and at the same time preserves its instrumental efficiency. Also the remote consummation, when it is reached, is experienced in such a way as to make it productive of further consummations. This integration of remote possibilities with the activity of the present, so that present activity has these possibilities as its meaning, is what we call vision.

Thus symbols and meaning properly used provide the cure for the kind of evil we are considering by eliminating that kind of consummatory experience which is not instrumental and by making instrumental activity an organic part of the consummation through the bond of meaning.

But it is not at all certain that all necessary instrumental processes of human life can be made to yield consummatory experience through the use of symbols and meaning. Certainly it can never be done as long as great numbers of people enjoy the products of the toil and suffering of others without making their enjoyment a form of producing further goods and thus sharing in the great community of life in which each man's good is every man's good and the good of all is the good of each through communication and universal participation in the common enterprise of bringing forth the highest possibilities of value. But even supposing this community of meaning and effort were achieved, or much more nearly approximated than is now the case, and supposing there were not parasitic indulgence in the enjoyment of goods which other men have produced, still even then it is highly doubtful if all the drudgery and pain of the world could be made enjoyable by integrating them through meaning and symbol with the highest fulfillments of life. The reason it cannot be done is because the physical conditions of much labor and suffering are of such sort as to make it impossible for the individual to discern such meaning in his experience. First of all, of course, the organic connection must be established between the labor and suffering of the lowliest on the one hand, and the highest consummations of life on the other. That we have already noted. For without that there would be no integrating meaning to discern. But even after this connection is established, we say, it may be impossible for the individual to discern the meaning, and experience the value of it, because of the physical conditions under which he is placed. He may accept the proposition as true that his suffering and labor do promote the total and common enterprise of all human living in striving for the highest values. But the mere intellectual apprehension of it is not sufficient. This meaning must engender the appropriate organic attitude, the correlative functioning of glands and viscera, else the value is not experienced. But it is just this organic attitude which is often made impossible by the circumstances imposed by the labor.

What, then, can be done with this disjunction of means and ends after the closest possible organic connection has been established between the activities and experiences of all men through the highest development of communication, through the reconstruction of political and economic structures, and the fullest use of symbols? The only further thing that can be done is to reduce to the minimum those physical conditions which render impossible the full appreciation of meaning in the doing of any labor or suffering any other evil. Whether these physical conditions, which shut out from the common and total good of life all who suffer them, can be brought to a lower minimum by increasing the total output of economic goods, or by returning to greater poverty for all human kind, is not for the present writer to say. But whatever may be required, the condition should be met. For the greatest good for all can never be reached as long as these physical conditions are not reduced to the utmost. Also, whether everyone should take his turn at this instrumental experience which cannot be made a way of participating in the consummatory experiences of life, is a further question to be settled. But the essential principle of the solution seems to be plain. All instrumental and consummatory experiences should, so far as possible, be bound together into a single organic totality by the highest possible development of meaning and communication through proper use of symbols. In this way all pain and labor that would otherwise be purely instrumental becomes a way of sharing in the highest good of life. And the highest good is progressively productive of further good. The last great obstacle to this end, we have noted, which may never be wholly eliminated, but only reduced to some minimum, is the physical conditions which make it impossible for the individual who is placed under them to share in this meaning of life.

SELECTIVE MEMORY

The fifth essential good of life is the preservation and accumulation of experiences which give to life its utmost loveliness. These are, pre-eminently, of two kinds—æsthetic and intimately social.

Æsthetic experience of natural and artistic objects contributes more richly to the good of life than most people recognize. They do not know how much they themselves are blessed in this way. When I walk outdoors on a spring day and am glad, I may not know that it is the beauty of the day which makes me so happy. The colors and shapes of a room may be clearly and vividly discerned; but even when they are not, they may fill me with a vague sense of rich loveliness the source of which I may not clearly discriminate. There is probably a streak of æsthetic experience, now wide and rich, now thin and meager, but more or less continuously running throughout most of our waking hours, and possibly also in sleep in the form of dreams. But our sensitivity and deep organic responsiveness to the colors and shapes and sounds and images which yield this experience, can be cultivated and thus the stream made wider and richer and more continuous.

There is generally some particular form of beauty which appeals most to an individual and contributes most to this sense of loveliness. For some it may be music, for others poetry. It may be natural scenes of sky and wood and sea and mountain and plain; or human faces, figures, dress, and movements. But whatever it be, it is something which should be cultivated as one of the great goods of life.

The cultivation of this value has two sides. One we have already noted. Our sensitivity must be cultivated so that whenever and wherever these forms of beauty appear they shall not pass us by without some response on our part. But there is another side to the matter which is equally important, although its importance is not so commonly recognized. After these forms of color and sound and rhythm and imagery, in art and nature, have been apprehended, one must cherish the vision of them. One must recall the loveliness so that it can stand before him ever anew until it comes at last to haunt him through the months and years. These precious experiences should be ever ready to float before him in ghostly presence so that, whenever his mind is free and nothing else demands his attention, there will come to him not some feeling of bitterness or envy or fear or worry, but, rather, the lilt of a song or the rhythm of a poem.

"What are you doing, little day moon,
  Over the April hill,
What are you doing up so soon,
Climbing the sky with silver shoon,
What are you doing at half past noon,
  Slipping along so still?"[1]

When he is too weary to think—or perhaps he is just waiting for a train—there visits him the vision of the mountains he saw in his youth, cold blue and streaked white, with a gleam that stabs the sky forever. When he has been ill and lies alone regaining his strength, there softly floats before his mind that scene in a deep wood at the foot of the Hartz Mountains. The trees rose high and met above his head so that no sunlight came through. But in the distance through the trunks he saw a shining light, and when he drew near he discovered what made the opening in the forest. There was a huge gray-blue granite bowlder and over it foamed a little cascade falling into a deep, dark pool. A bit of a rainbow shimmered in the spray and at the side of the pool a great scarlet flower with its nodding image in the rippling water.

---

[1] The present writer does not know the author of these lines. He found them on a newspaper clipping posted in a public library.

But there is another kind of experience which must also be cherished in the mind until it rises from the memory whenever the mind is free. Rare and beautiful experiences of friendship must follow us through the years like a trailing cloud. They are so precious and rare they must not be allowed to lapse into oblivion. To that end one will deliberately draw aside from time to time and there in solitude call them up and count them over one by one as you count beads upon a rosary. This will be his worship with his rosary of precious memories.

What we shall remember of the past is partly under our control. Some memories can be cultivated. We all have had experiences which embitter and degrade; and we all have had experiences which bless and sanctify. These last can be preserved in memory if we make it our business to keep them fresh and vivid. The world is cold and mean enough, but there are moments when a tender, trembling beauty falls upon it as from another realm. These moments must not be lost. Minds that remember can keep them. It is the high vocation of art to preserve them in symbol and story; and the growing tradition of the human race must accumulate them through the centuries. Thus a heritage may be gathered and transmitted to each generation with an added store of gracious and noble tradition, carried by every symbol at our command, by the modulation of the voice, the gesture and attitude of the body, and the whole manner of life. Thus man acquires a spirit, a trailing cloud of lovely light.

The part of each individual in this total enterprise is to preserve his own most precious experiences until his own personality radiates their graciousness and delicacy and tenderness. This he can do by observing seasons of worship when he takes out his rosary of memories—the lilt of a song, the rhythm of a poem, a scarlet flower reflected in a dark pool, the look on someone's face, the touch of a vanished hand. This rosary he must wear so close to his heart that it becomes a part of his personality and in seasons of worshipful meditation he must count the pearls until he comes to the cross at the end.

How to Fail

Failure is inevitable. No man can escape it, somewhere, sometime, to some degree. As truly as every man has a rendezvous with death so also everyone somewhere, on some disputed barricade, has a rendezvous with failure. He who thinks he never has failed and never will is blinded by conceit and foolish optimism. Hence the problem is, how to fail. When failure comes, as come it must, how can I deal with it? Can I transform it from a total liability into some kind of an asset?

The two alternative ways of life are not that you have here a life that is all success and there a life that is all failure, but, rather, here you have a life with great successes and great failures and there a life with little successes and little failures. The only way to avoid great failures is to avoid great successes, to hug the shore, never venture out into the deep, never attempt anything too difficult, keep well within the bounds of assured achievement. In that way a man can avoid all failures except one. That one is to fail to live the good life.

There are two kinds of failure. One is the failure of a particular enterprise and the other is the failure of a lifetime. One is occasional failure and the other grand failure. These two must be treated in different ways. The good to be extracted from occasional failure is wisdom. There are some things we can learn from the testimony of others; and some we learn by thinking them out for ourselves. But the most important and subtle wisdom of life cannot be put into words nor symbolized in any way. It cannot be learned from others nor by observation nor by constructive exercise of imagination. It can only be gathered from experience, and that means experience of failure. Some men have garnered deep wisdom from failure, but others with just as much experience of it have learned nothing. Failure will yield unwordable wisdom of life if it is faced in the right way, but otherwise not.

How must one deal with failure to make it serve the good life? First of all the fact of failure must be admitted. This is a hard saying and for some people almost impossible. Often we conceal the fact of failure by an unconscious mechanism which the psychologists call projection. We blame the failure on someone else. Perhaps it was the fault of the institution or simply "the slings and arrows of outrageous fortune." But it was not I. When I strike at the nail and hit my thumb I first suck my thumb and then kick the cat. We preserve our self-respect by devious ways.

There is another device by which we quite subconsciously hide our failures out of sight. Not only did we not fail, but nothing has gone wrong. We assume a beaming attitude toward everything and everybody and all is sweet and beautiful. This might be called pollyannism. This is a very popular attitude and is supported by a popular philosophy. This popular philosophy asserts: "Never admit failure. Always affirm success. Always think success." That sounds nice and feels nicer still. But it has one difficulty. The difficulty is that he who never admits the fact of failure, and never notes what led up to it and what issued from it, will never learn the lesson that it had to teach him. He will never gain that deep wisdom which conscious recognition and examination of one's own failures can give.

Here we have one of the most fundamental differences between men. On the one hand we have those who prefer illusion to reality when reality is difficult or otherwise unpleasant, and who always develop an illusion to conceal reality when the latter becomes very bitter, although this they do quite unconsciously through the exercise of a subconscious mental attitude. On the other hand are those who prefer reality to illusion no matter how sweet the illusion may be and no matter how bitter the reality. They prefer reality, for one thing, because they have that kind of religion which seeks the best that reality has to offer, and while this particular bit of reality may not be good, they know that if they play fast and loose with reality, they can never follow it far enough and close enough to find the best that ever may be. The implication of the attitude of the first group is that the best that ever may be is an illusion, although they may not consciously profess this. The implication of the second group is that some form of that kind of reality which is not an illusion is the best that life can ever attain. Which is right is perhaps a question that can never be conclusively demonstrated. The difference here is so basic that it forms a chasm which can scarcely be bridged by any sort of argument.

One of the chief reasons why people shun reality when it is disagreeable, and especially that kind of disagreeable reality called failure, is because, if they admitted it, they would lose their courage. Their zest and drive would fail. To preserve these they must constantly affirm success and think success, even when the truth is not success, but failure. Perhaps the chief argument against the way of sweet illusion lies right here. He who cherishes illusions to keep up his courage and his zeal becomes less and less able to face disagreeable reality until at last he must wrap himself so deeply in dreams that he cannot live at all unless others protect and keep him. He must then become a parasite or perish. As a matter of fact, perhaps most people who are greatly addicted to illusion are parasites.

The whole problem of dealing with occasional failure, then, resolves itself to this: How can I face the fact of failure, especially when it is disastrous, and at the same time keep up my courage so that striving will be unabated? How face failure without despair? This is possible when a man considers his own personality and his whole life simply as a tool for the service of some cause. Then he can look at himself and his own efforts objectively, impersonally, as he would look at any tool and its work. Then any defect of the tool or any fault in its work is simply something to correct. Self-consciousness is removed. A sense of one's own success, one's own self-respect and honor and dignity, is eliminated. There is simply the tool called myself to be used for whatever it is worth, and the cause to be promoted in whatever measure this tool can promote it. Since the cause is greater than oneself and does not depend upon the success or failure of one's own efforts, although it is hindered or promoted thereby, all sensitivity about the success and failure of oneself is cast out. Thus failure does not bring despair nor success conceit, because the self and the personal life of the individual are subordinated to something much greater. Father Vaillant, in Willa Cather's *Death Comes to the Archbishop,* is an excellent example of this way of living. When one looks at himself in such a manner, he can admit failure when it occurs without a sense of despair or loss of driving propulsion, and so learn the wisdom which failures may give.

But the failure of a lifetime is another matter. In such failure wisdom is of no value, for the individual has only the one life to live. If he could live his life over again, the failure of his first life might be of value in teaching him how better to live the next time. But that is impossible so far as we know. Is there, then, any way to redeem grand failure?

Here we come to a very remarkable fact. Apparently the greatest personalities in history, measuring greatness by the magnitude of their influence, have lived what can only be called a lifetime failure so far as their own achievement was concerned. Three such personalities we would mention. The last of these three is not yet a failure, for he is still living, but it is quite likely that the total enterprise of his life will go down in the end to most overwhelming failure. Things seem to point that way. The three we have in mind are Jesus, Socrates, and Ghandi. Ghandi has not yet failed, but he probably will; and if he does, it will be a lifetime of failure from which he can gather no wisdom which will help him, for his course will be run.

Socrates spent all his life trying to find the truth by clarifying concepts. The Sophists had made it seem that there were no principles of right or wrong or true or false that were sufficiently fixed to be trustworthy for the conduct of life. Socrates spent his life trying to establish such principles. But he never succeeded. He never established a single one. While scholars differ concerning just what Socrates did accomplish, it seems that his major objective was never reached. The truth concerning true and false and right and wrong escaped him. He was no better than the Sophists whom he sought to refute, so far as concerned any definite accomplishment of his own. The chief difference between him and them was that his life was a failure because he tried to do otherwise, while their lives were not failures because they succeeded in doing what they tried to do. When the oracle said Socrates was the wisest man, he was puzzled at first, but finally explained it by saying that while nobody knew anything, he knew he knew nothing, while others did not know that much. He might have added that while he tried to know and failed, others did not try and so did not fail.

That the life of Jesus was a failure in the same sense, we believe all must admit. The crowd never understood him and had abandoned him before the end. A little handful of followers still clung to him, but he failed to do with them what he had given his life to accomplish. They never understood him. They never shared his purpose. They felt there was something sublime about him. They followed him with dog-like devotion. Dumbly and miserably and all perplexed they followed him to the end, but they never got what he sought to transmit to them. During his life they misunderstood him and after his death they worshiped him in a way he would have forbidden. In both cases they failed to share his vision and promote his purpose.

What will be the end of Ghandi's unbelievable career no one can say. He has done what no one could have dreamed was possible. Already he is well-nigh a myth. But surely he cannot succeed with the world as it is. We would judge that the only outcome is a failure in which the whole movement of peaceful non-co-operation which he has so laboriously and painfully built up throughout his life will be swept away in blood and violence. But after the centuries have passed, Ghandi will probably take his place along with those other paradoxical personalities who somehow by means of their very failure have wielded an influence greater than others.

How can this paradox be explained, that failure has exerted such an enormous influence? We believe it is not far to seek. No man can drive me to follow an untrodden trail save the man who has failed to tread it. No man can lead me to build a house save he who has himself not built it. Men cannot be roused to carry through the great revolutionary achievements of history requiring centuries of labor and sacrifice by mere exhortation. A single individual can be a persistent influence in leading many generations in such an undertaking only if he has won the hearts of men and grandly failed. This, we believe, explains the paradox.

We have spoken of world-famous characters. The same principle, in a smaller way, applies to inconspicuous figures. Someone whom we have known and loved, who strove to do a work and failed, has probably shaped our lives more potently than any other. Such a one has left a heritage. Thus the failure of a lifetime is transmuted. The man who succeeds may inspire me to do what he has done; but the only man who can lead me to strive to do what he has never done is he who has tried and failed to do it.

Perhaps that striving after the unattained possibilities of life, which is the chief characteristic of the human animal and the only excuse for his restless, rebellious, chaotic and dangerous existence, is a striving which springs anew in each generation because of the influence of devoted lives that have failed. With the breath of these lives upon us we are not deaf to the call of something on beyond. Their efforts were exploratory and experimental, and hence their failure served to unveil possibilities which lure us after they are gone. He who learns to fail this way shall not have failed in vain. But he must keep close to the hearts of men.

CHAPTER V

RELIGION

In discussing religion there are always two initial questions which must be answered either implicitly or explicitly. They are: What is religion in general? and, second, What is that particular kind of religion, if any, which you advocate? We shall try to give an answer to both these questions.

What Is Religion?

Religion in general is reacting to something as though it were that to which all human life should be devoted. Religion of the sort we wish to advocate is dedicating life in supreme devotion to that order of existence and possibility which provides the highest values which ever can be actualized. This order with its highest possibilities of value is largely unexplored and unknown. Nevertheless, we believe we know something about it and in the sequel will state something of what we believe it to be. But inasmuch as our knowledge is not infallible, hence may be in error, and inasmuch as we do not in any case know nearly as much as we would like about this order with its possibilities, our religious devotion must be given to something which is in great part unknown. This is what we call high religion. It is difficult religion, but we believe it is the best kind and it is the sort we wish to advocate. But before we consider this kind of religion which we desire to defend, we must first discuss the general definition of religion, that is to say, the essence which is common to all religion, both good and bad, true and false.

Religion is reacting to something as though it were that to which all human life should be devoted. In tribal or national religions the human life that is thought to owe allegiance to this object of devotion is limited to the tribe or other group, but that is because such groups, at the time their religion arose, did not think people outside the group were human in just the same sense as the members of the group. So we do not think such cases are exceptions to our definition. In any case religion tends to develop to the point where it considers the object of devotion worthy of the allegiance of all men. The object thus revered may be conceived as an order of many objects, as in polytheism; but the tendency has been toward monotheism.

Religion is not merely a matter of believing. Hence we say religion is reacting to, that is, thinking, feeling, acting toward, an object as being worthy of universal devotion. It is not sufficient that the individual merely believe the object to be of such importance for all human life. He must react to it as having such importance. Also it is not sufficient that the individual accept it as object of supreme devotion for himself alone. He must react to it as though it were properly such an object for all men, even though other men may not so accept it, and even though he may not try to induce them to do so. It is possible for an individual to have this religious attitude toward an object when no other man accepts it as sovereign object of loyalty. That is not common, but it is possible, and in the case of certain individuals has occurred. We believe that in the case of great religious initiators and innovators such has been the case. They conceived this object of religious devotion differently from others and, until they won followers, were alone in their attitude to their chosen object. But the object is not a religious object, and the attitude is not a religious attitude, unless the attitude implies that this object *should* be accepted by all men, as well as by the individual, as their chief object in life.

This something to which the individual reacts religiously is esteemed to be an order of value. That is the implication of such an attitude toward it. This order of value may be conceived as a personality. Personality is an order of value. Or it may be conceived as an ideal or as a system of ideals, as the humanists do. Ideals are also orders of value. Whether the object is personal or impersonal, one or many, existent or ideal, makes no difference so far as our definition goes. All are instances of religion if the reaction be of the sort indicated. No more restricted definition can comprehend the diverse historic instances of religion. Religion is reacting to an object, personal or impersonal, one or many, existent or ideal, as though it were the object to which all human life should be devoted.

The object to which the individual or group thus reacts religiously is not necessarily a worthy object. When we say it is an order of value, we mean the individual reacts to it as though it were such. But religions can be infected with error, just as anything else which man does. Also they can be infected with evil. Religions are more or less true and more or less false according as the object which is judged to be supremely important for human living is truly or approximately so. The object of supreme devotion may be of such sort as to glorify or to degrade human living; and nothing so potently determines the glory or the degradation of life as the supreme devotion which dominates it.

The chief test of a definition of religion is the accuracy with which it distinguishes between the religious man and the unreligious man, or between the religious moments of an individual and his unreligious moments. A definition which does not make any such sharp distinction, but which includes all human life in its scope, is worthless because it fails to define anything.

The chief purpose of definition is to draw a clear line of demarcation between what is and what is not the matter under consideration. The definition that fails to do that is not a definition. Let us then see what our definition excludes as being not religion.

A man may be passionately devoted to some enterprise, such as trying to become President of the United States, or striving to be a great artist, or playing the stock market, but his devotion is not religious according to our proposed statement. He might give the last full measure of devotion in service of some cause yet it would not be religious unless he served the cause as though it had the kind and degree of value which make it the proper cause for all men to serve in like manner, even though other men may refuse to accept it as having such value. Mere purposiveness, no matter how passionate, is not religious unless the purpose is directed to what is believed to be of greatest importance not only for the individual, but also for all others. Hence the man who experiences religion must have an evangel. He has a way of life to share with all men, and all men must share it, so he believes, if they are to find the great values and escape the great ills. In some religions the devotees do not try to share their devotion with others. They think others are incapable or unworthy of such a high vocation. But their religious object, whether personal or impersonal, existent or ideal, they revere as *worthy* of the devotion of all and offering the highest fulfillment of all human life, even when they think many men are not worth the trouble of winning to this way of life. However, religion in its most complete development, when the implications of the religious attitude are fully expressed, tends to seek the fellowship of all in a common devotion, and the reason for this is made apparent in our definition.

Religion is essentially reconstructive and revolutionary. In this respect it differs from morality although morality may be religious. Morality which is not religious seeks to organize all interests so that they can work together, so far as possible excluding those which are recalcitrant to the organization. Religion, on the other hand, does not seek merely to make interests work together. It seeks, rather, to transform interests so that they will serve, or find fulfillment in, that order which is the object of religious devotion. Religion seeks not merely to organize interests so that they will be harmonious, but it seeks to achieve that special kind of organization which will embody most completely the order of value which is revered as the will of God, or the kingdom of God, or Nirvana, or however the religion may conceive it. Some religions are much more revolutionary than others. So also are some moralities. When a morality becomes sufficiently passionate and reconstructive of life, with a gospel to spread and a zeal to make life over into the order of God (or whatever takes the place of God), it begins to be a religion. On the other hand, when a religion loses its passion and seeks not to change life except in so far as is needed to make things work together smoothly, it begins to be a morality and not a religion. Religion seeks to convert the individual and to transform the world. Morality tries to do neither. Nevertheless, morality and religion can merge and often do.

One of the most zealous religions in the world to-day is Russian communism. It claims a saving evangel for all mankind. It has an object of supreme devotion, namely, an idealized social order. It is so passionate in its missionary zeal that it strives to extirpate every other religion and refuses to call itself a religion in order that its condemnation of all its rivals may be the more sweeping. But any movement which seeks to supplant all religions and provide a way of life to take their place which is held to be the way to greatest values, requiring a radical reconstruction of the world and a passionate devotion, is certainly a religion. Russian communism is precisely that.

A few American pragmatists have made their moral philosophy a religion. They also fight rival religions with religious zeal and refuse to admit the religious nature of their own devotion. They have a gospel to preach and preach it with all the fervor of any religion. They strive to win adherents, to convert the individual to a common devotion with them, to make the world anew into the order of fraternity, equality, and liberty or some other order which is accepted as supreme, and they do this not as a means to some ulterior end, not for the sake of promoting the prestige of a party or for any selfish reason, but solely because they react to their order of value as that to which all men should be devoted and to which they must be won in order to bring the life of mankind to its highest fulfillment.

John Dewey himself does not fall into this error of lifting his moral philosophy into a religion and denouncing everything which goes by the name of religion. He has sketched in a very meager way the kind of religion which he would support, and he properly calls it religion. He distinguishes between two kinds of religion. First is that kind which identifies itself with some theory of the present state of existence, representing the object of supreme devotion as already existing in some metaphysical realm. On the other hand is that kind of religion which leaves the question of what the nature of existence may be to all the techniques of investigation with full recognition that we as yet do not know much about it and that our present ideas will probably undergo great changes. But he recognizes that there is an order of existence, which gives rise to the highest possibilities of value that can be actualized. Religious devotion is given to these possibilities.

Some of his own statements bearing upon this matter are as follows, taken from the last chapter of his most recent book, *The Quest of Certainty.*

"A sense of the possibilities of existence and devotion to the cause of these possibilities"[1] is the kind of religion he thinks is important. He proceeds: "Whatever is discovered about actual existence would modify the content of human beliefs about ends, purposes, and goods. But it would and could not touch the fact that we are capable of directing our affection and loyalty to the possibilities resident in the actualities discovered. An idealism of action that is devoted to creation of a future, instead of staking itself upon propositions about the past, is invincible."[2] "The energy which is diverted into defense of positions that have in time to be surrendered would be released for positive activity in behalf of the security of the underlying possibilities of actual life. More important still would be liberation from attachment to dogmas framed in conditions very unlike those in which we live, and the substitution of a disposition to turn to constructive account the results of knowledge. It is not possible to estimate the amelioration that would result if the stimulus and support given to practical action by science were no longer limited to industry and commerce and merely 'secular' affairs. . . . Religious faith which attaches itself to the possibilities of nature and associated living would, with its devotion to the ideal, manifest piety toward the actual. Respect and esteem would be given to that which is the means of realization of possibilities, and to that in which the ideal is embodied if it ever finds embodiment. . . . Nature and society include within themselves projection of ideal possibilities and contain the operations by which they are actualized. Nature may not be worshiped as divine even in the sense of the intellectual love of Spinoza. But nature, including humanity, with all its defects and imperfections, may evoke heartfelt piety as the source of ideals, of possibilities, of aspiration in their behalf, and as the eventual abode of all attained goods and excellencies."[3]

---

[1] From *The Quest of Certainty*, by John Dewey. Reprinted by courtesy of the publishers, Minton, Balch & Company, New York.

[2] *Op. cit.*, pp. 304-305.

The personal attitude involved in all religious experience is the sense of dependence and this sense of dependence, Dewey declares, will not be diminished, but will be quickened by the "Copernican revolution" which is now occurring in human thought, "which looks to security amid change instead of to certainty in attachment to the fixed."[4]

---

[3] *Op. cit.*, p. 306.

[4] *Op. cit.*, p. 307.

Here we have in meager outline the sketch of a form of religion which we believe is exceedingly important. This type of religion is one which is destined, we believe, to become increasingly potent. As Dewey says, it would be "invincible" and its power to ameliorate the lot of man "it is not possible to estimate," for it would be able to appropriate and apply to the interests of religion that "stimulus and support to practical action" which science now lends almost exclusively to secular affairs. Such a religion has great work in the world to do if it can be developed.

We have noted a number of specific instances of living which represent religion and a number which are instances of nonreligion. Perhaps these will suffice to show that our definition is truly definitive and distinguishes between wide regions of life which are not religious and those which are. We believe this definition fits the historical cases of religion.

For example, let us apply our definition to the case of socially accepted ideals as objects of religious devotion. When would the attitude toward such ideals be religious and when not? When these ideals are revered as constituting the supreme good for all men everywhere, when these ideals are spread to all men as an evangel, and when the devotees strive to refashion the world into the likeness of these ideals, then the reaction to them is a religious reaction. But if, on the other hand, these ideals are treated merely as paths and roads which the group must travel in their quest of unexplored goods lying on beyond, then this something unattained on beyond the ideals is the object of religious response. Religious devotion is then given to that unexplored order transcending the socially accepted ideals. In such case loyalty to socially accepted ideals would not be religion. Or, again, if one gave his supreme devotion to socially accepted ideals as the highest, but did not react to them as the proper objects of devotion for all men everywhere, we would not have a case of religion. A religion which did make socially accepted ideals the highest object of allegiance for all men would be a true and good religion only if such ideals really did constitute the object of highest value for all men everywhere, being of greater value than any existence or possibility which might ever be found throughout the whole range of reality.

Many cases can be found which are doubtful cases according to this statement of the nature of religion, but that is true of any definition. Especially would that be true of those early forms of religion which have not yet fully developed the distinctive religious character. But so also man or plant or horse or any other growing and developing form of life reveals cases, especially in the early stages of its development, which are impossible to classify because they are border-line cases. They have hardly yet become that which is being defined. Also no definition can be final and perfect because definitions must vary according to the purpose for which they are used.

The object of religious reaction may not be a worthy object. It may be something quite foolish. It may be of such sort that devotion to it is disastrously obstructive to any striving after the genuine values of life. Intelligence is just as much needed in religion as anywhere else. Unintelligent religion may be the worst thing in human life. The intellectual examination of that which is religiously held to be supremely important, and criticism of religious reaction to it, is called philosophy. A religion may criticize itself, in which case it has its own philosophy; or it may be criticized by a philosophy outside itself. Such criticism does not guarantee that the religious object and reaction to it will be free of error and evil, but this criticism and examination of religious belief and practice by philosophy ought to purge it of some error and redirect some of its energies. In any case such criticism is all the human mind can do.

Religion Without God

There is a growing interest at the present time in developing a religion without God. We believe this is chiefly due to confusion and misunderstanding in respect to the idea of God, and if this concept can be adequately clarified the issue may settle itself.

When religion is maintained without professing belief in God, the object of supreme devotion is generally called an ideal. When belief in God is professed, the object of devotion is called God. But in both cases the object of devotion is an order of value to which the individual reacts as though it were worthy of being the supreme object of devotion for all human life. Hence the whole issue involved in the contrast between religion with God and religion without God is the issue between God and the ideal. Both parties are at one in striving to bring into existence the greatest possible value. The only question is whether God and the ideal are both involved in the attainment of this highest value or only the ideal without God.

If God is not essentially involved in the attainment of the greatest good that is possible, then the quicker we all find that out and acknowledge it, the better. If God is not involved, then the discarding of all belief in God is not a loss. It is a great gain. If God is not involved, then the religious cause cannot be served intelligently, and the urgently needed work of religion can never be done effectively until we get rid of this crippling, stultifying superstition about God. If, on the other hand, God is essentially involved in the cause, then we can never serve it with power and intelligence until we discern that fact and conform to it. Hence we have nothing to lose and all to gain by discovering the truth. It is a question to be settled like any other question of fact—calmly, dispassionately, by the utmost exercise of intelligence and by examining all the evidence and all the logic involved. Surely, the most ardent theist must admit that if God is not essentially involved in the cause of values, then the quicker we discover that fact and devote ourselves to genuine reality without self-deceit, the better. Surely, likewise, the most ardent religious atheist must admit that if God is essentially involved in our values, the quicker we discover the fact and devote ourselves to genuine reality without self-deceit, the better.

But this question must not be confused with the use of the word "God." Whether we continue to use the word of three letters commencing with G is a matter of minor importance. It may be that this word has accumulated such psychological associations for some people that they ought not to use it and no one ought to try to persuade them to do so. It may be that the word has become more of a liability than an asset for all mankind and therefore everybody ought to discard it from all religious usage. But the word is not the reality under consideration. Words are mere squeaks, altogether trivial, and when this squeak is considered precious to fight and die for, or at least to grieve for when lost, we have a perversion of values which is a very great evil. The squeak is not what we are considering. The only point under consideration is whether that something which we indicate by the word "God," but which might be indicated by another word, is essentially involved in that order of value in which human life must find its fulfillment.

It is not a question of what we ought to believe for the sake of morality or piety. It is not a matter of reverence or loyalty or devotion to values. It is simply a matter of fact. Is God involved in the progressive organization of the world which makes for highest value or is he not? If God is essentially involved, then the atheist is serving God when he serves this cause, no matter how much he may deny it and no matter how ignorant he may be of the fact. If God is essentially involved, the atheist is simply ignorant and unenlightened and mentally confused in his religion, just as the theist must be if God is not essentially involved. Therefore when a man, who is dedicated to the cause of promoting highest values for all men, denies there is a God when there is, or affirms there is a God when there is not, it is useless to ridicule him or denounce him or fight him or be enraged at him. What he needs is enlightenment. What he needs is to have his thinking clarified.

However, the difference between the religious theist and the religious atheist may be, and we believe often is, merely a misunderstanding in the use of words. When that is the case, then neither is necessarily ignorant nor unintelligent nor confused. They are simply understanding words in different sense. In that case what is needed is further clarification in use of terms. Let us, then, before we undertake to ascertain whether God is essentially involved in the cause which all genuine religion must serve, define our terms. The terms are "God" and "ideal."

Walter Lippmann has written concerning modernized ideas of God: "But certainly this is not the God of the ancient faith. This is a highly sophisticated idea of God, employed by a modern man who would like to say, but cannot say with certainty, that there exists a personal God to whom men can accommodate themselves. . . . My answer is that a conception of God which is incomprehensible to all who are not highly trained logicians, is a possible God for logicians alone."[5]

Suppose we apply this same reasoning to other well-known objects such as the United States or the earth. Any idea of United States which approximates accuracy and completeness is so complex and profound as to be incomprehensible to all who are not highly trained in political science. Are we, then, to conclude that there can be no United States save for such experts? The modern scientific conception of the earth is incomprehensible to all who are not highly trained in astrophysics, including the theory of relativity. Are we, then, to conclude that there is a possible earth only for physicists and astronomers? If we reject such reasoning when applied to earth and United States, we must also reject it when applied to God.

---

[5] From *Preface to Morals*, by Walter Lippmann. Reprinted by permission of The Macmillan Company.

Until recent date the word "earth" was used to refer to that flat surface which supports us and our houses. But advancing knowledge revealed the error in this idea of the earth. However, many people have found the idea of a round earth on which we walk "upside down" incomprehensible. Indeed, such an idea was so offensive and so disturbing to the religious faith of the great mass of people in the sixteenth century that the experts who taught it were ridiculed and persecuted. But suppose the teachers and thinkers who recognized the roundness of the earth had continued to refer to the earth as flat in order to be "comprehensible" to those who were not expert in this branch of knowledge, and also in order to minister to their souls and to support the social order by not disturbing those convictions about which the habits and purposes of life were so closely entwined. If this policy had been adopted, we would have to-day very much the same state of mind concerning the earth that we now have concerning God. A considerable number would still be devout believers in a flat earth. But a large and increasing number would be denying the existence of any such thing as an earth, meaning by "earth" a flat surface supporting us in the midst of the stars.

A third group, however, would be insisting that the earth does exist, only it is not flat, it is round. This third group would be attacked by both the others. The devout believers would oppose them as being the source of confusion and perplexity. "What is this strange, incomprehensible idea of earth that you present? I know not what you mean." Some would be more violent and aggressive and denounce this newfangled idea of a round earth as treason to the faith. The disbelievers, on the other hand, who denied the existence of any earth at all in the sense of a flat surface, would oppose the upholders of a round earth in some such words as these: "This is not the earth of the ancient faith. This is not earth the supporter, earth the flat surface, the center of the universe. This is a highly sophisticated idea of earth, employed by a modern man who would like to say, but cannot say with certainty, that there exists a supporting earth to which men can accommodate themselves. . . . My answer is that a conception of earth which is incomprehensible to all who are not highly trained scientists, is a possible earth for scientists alone." Then the inevitable conclusion would be drawn, as Lippmann draws it for God, that the "earth" is a myth, an idea which may have been useful in its time, but is now outgrown and impossible for any intelligent and well-informed person, because there is no flat surface on which we walk and build our houses.

Over against this reasoning the third group would protest. There is a spherical planet, they would insist, which supports us and all our works, and that is what we mean by earth. To which the skeptics would reply: "You have no right to use the word 'earth' with such a meaning. You simply perpetuate an old error by doing so and produce confusion. The word 'earth' has a definite historical meaning. It means a flat supporting surface—not something to which we cling like flies. To use the word in any other sense is to play fast and loose with language and to lead people astray." So the controversy would rage.

Now, all this applies precisely to the idea of God, only in respect to the idea of God the situation pictured above is not imaginary. It is the actual present state of human thought. Why does this state of thought actually hold in respect to the idea of God but not in respect to that of the earth? Because in respect to the conception of God the teachers and thinkers actually have done what we have imagined them doing with the idea of the earth. They have tried to make the idea of God fit the needs and wishes of the people whom they sought to serve. Investigators of the earth felt no such constraint, or at least not to the same degree, although Galileo and others did hesitate and vacillate a good deal in public declarations about the new theories. But the truth about the earth was their chief concern, not the needs of the human heart as shaped by ancient tradition. But these needs of the heart played a very large part in determining what was taught concerning God. They who have been responsible for the idea of God have also been deeply concerned with ministry to the welfare and peace of mind of the mass of humanity. Therefore they felt under constraint to shape their conception of God in such a way as to give people comfort and peace. That means that the established ways of thinking be not too suddenly and radically disturbed. If the investigators of the earth had felt this same constraint to the same degree, they would have done with the idea of the earth what theologians have done with the idea of God and we would have to-day that threefold controversy about the earth which we described above, one group saying the earth is flat, another that there is no earth at all, and a third group, misunderstood by both the other two, saying there is an earth, but it is not flat, it is round. In respect to God there actually are these three groups, one saying God is a personality like you and me, another denying there is a God in this sense, and a third insisting that there is a God, but that he is not a personality like you and me.

Shall we go on trying to shape the idea of God to fit the needs of the human heart? If we do, we shall go from bad to worse, for the present confusion has resulted precisely in trying to do that very thing. Meeting the needs of the human heart always means conforming to established tradition. The greatest teachers of religion have never tried to shape the idea of God to meet the needs of the human heart, but, rather, have declared that the human heart must be changed to meet the requirements of God or be damned.

Of the three controversial groups we have mentioned, which is in the right, they who say God is a personality with a focalized, attentive consciousness, with plans and ideas, like our own; or those who deny there is a God; or those who affirm God, but say he is not a personality? Which would be right if they were discussing the earth in the manner above described, one saying it is flat, the other that there is no earth, and the third that there is an earth, but it is not flat? Both the second and third groups would be right, the second in denying there is any earth which is flat and the third in affirming there is an earth which is not flat. When these two fall into conflict, it is due to a tragic misunderstanding, and yet a very natural misunderstanding. It is with hope of alleviating this misunderstanding that we must try to clarify the conceptions of ideal and God.

CHAPTER VI

GOD AND THE IDEAL

THE advocate of religion without God makes the ideal the supreme object of religious devotion. The theist regards God in that light. What does the religious humanist who disbelieves in God mean by the ideal? And what does the theist who disbelieves in the personality of God mean by "God"? These are the two questions we must try to answer.

The ideal may mean either one of two things. It may mean (1) some human idea of a possible good to be attained by human effort, or (2) that which truly is a possible good to be attained by human effort. These two must not be confused, although men often do fail to distinguish between them. My idea of the attainable good is by no means identical with what truly is good and attainable. The fallibility of the human mind is notorious and nowhere, perhaps, is its fallibility greater than in respect to unattained goods which are strongly desired.

My idea of the program of action leading to highest fulfillment of life in any particular situation is one thing. What truly is the course of action leading to highest fulfillment in that situation is something different. At best, my idea merely approximates the best. What truly is the way to the attainment of the highest fulfillment is the ideal in one sense. My idea of it is the ideal in another sense. Failure to distinguish between these two meanings of ideal leads to great confusion. They differ on two points: first, with regard to the program of action specified; second, with regard to the nature of the fulfillment to be attained. If we identify ideal with our idea of the program and its fulfillment, then the ideal should never be made the supreme object of aspiration. If we identify ideal with what truly is the highest fulfillment of life and the means to its attainment relative to existent conditions, however different these may be from our ideas of them, then the ideal should be supreme, with certain qualifications to be mentioned later.

There is still a third meaning of the ideal which we shall merely mention. It is our idea of something which does not exist and is not attainable, which is impossible, but which is loved and adored just the same. Here there need be no distinction between the idea of the good and the good itself. The idea is the good, the good is the idea. There is no other good to be had save the idea. There is a kind of religion which makes that kind of ideal the object of supreme devotion. In such case the ideal is not something to strive to achieve, because it cannot be achieved or even approximated. It is simply something to cherish, a dream. Such a religion may be comfortable and ornamental. It plainly has no constructive or reconstructive power. It is a harmless and futile kind of religion provided it is not allowed to approach the dimensions of paranoia. But it is not the kind of religion represented by the sort of humanism we are here considering. Therefore we shall ignore it and turn our attention exclusively to the two kinds of ideals, or two meanings of the ideal, distinguished above.

We cannot escape the conclusion that, if by ideal we mean man's idea of the good to be sought, the ideal is not identical with what truly is the good to be sought, and often is very foolish and evil. Still, again, perhaps even more frequently, it is something which is not attainable and cannot even be approximated by human effort.

But all these difficulties can be avoided if we understand by the ideal not merely our ideas, but that which truly is the possible good to be sought. We must have ideas about it, to be sure, but our ideas are not identical with it. If our ideas were identical with it, then there would be nothing to seek after we got the idea because the idea would be all there was to it. But if the ideal is an objective, nonexistent possibility to be sought, and perhaps progressively sought, then there truly is something to be done about it besides merely coddling the idea. Furthermore, if the ideal is such an objective possibility, our ideas about it are subject to correction, to improvement and growth and ought to change. But the idea is merely the feeler, the hand that gropes, the light that searches, the instrument that achieves. It is not the ideal. The ideal is that which truly is both good and attainable even when our ideas miss it. With such ideas we can make the ideal the object of our quest and our devotion because it is not identical with our idea of it. It is that for which we strive by means of ideas.

With this understanding of the ideal, the supreme ideal would be the highest possibility of value that can ever be actualized through anything which man can ever do. This highest possibility of value may be a whole series of possibilities, or a system. But what its content may be is not now our question. We are only trying to define what we shall mean when we speak of the ideal. This possible good to be attained by human effort has been most diversely conceived and misconceived. The South Sea Islanders had their idea of it and so did the Hebrew prophets. The modern religious humanist may have still another idea of it. It may be that the greatest possible good to be sought or promoted by these several groups was wholly diverse the one from the other, or it may be that there was something in common between them and they were all engaged in promoting a total system of good. But all such questions are ulterior to the present task, which is to define ideal. By "ideal" we here understand the possible good which the individual or group may achieve by rightly directed efforts. It is not identical with the idea which the individual or group may hold concerning it, although this idea, rightly formulated, is a necessary tool to be used in achieving or approximating or promoting it.

We have seen that if, when the religious humanist speaks of the ideal he means a human idea of the best to be attained, and sets up that idea as the supreme object of religious devotion, he is putting himself in an indefensible position. But if by ideal he means the best that may be sought and achieved, even though that best be very different from our present idea of it, then he has something which truly must be an object of great concern. But when ideal is so conceived, God is essentially involved in its attainment.

If this is what is meant by the ideal, what is meant by God? We must distinguish between God and the idea of God, just as we found it necessary to distinguish between the ideal and the idea of the possible good. Endless confusion arises when we fail to make this distinction either in respect to the ideal or in respect to God. God does not mean simply and solely that idea of God which was revered by the Crusaders or by the Hebrew prophets or by Jesus. It does not mean any single historical instance of the idea of God, any more than ideal means any single historical instance of the idea of the good. Ideas must not be confounded with the objects to which they refer. To be sure, people often do confound the two. A tribe, for example, when conquered, may retain its old ideas of the gods and add to them the ideas of the gods which prevail among the conquerors. But instead of using these new ideas to correct and clarify the older, the members of the tribe simply increase the number of gods by adding the two together because they fail to distinguish between god and the idea of god. When the ideas increase, the gods increase. But this muddle-headed confusion of simple and undisciplined minds is no excuse for a modern thinker falling into the same absurdity. "God," like "ideal," means that which human ideas endeavor to grasp. The ideal, that is, the highest possibility of value for mankind, can be distinguished from the historical formulations of it. So, likewise, God can be distinguished from the historically accepted ideas used to refer to him and seek after him.

We have defined the ideal. How shall we define God? God is not merely a possibility to be achieved. That is the ideal. But God is that order of existence and possibility by virtue of which the greatest possible good is truly a possibility and can be achieved by human effort. No possibility is a possibility merely by thinking it, although thinking may well be a necessary factor in making it a possibility. But a possibility can be such only when there is some order which makes it so. Human effort can be efficacious in bringing a desired possibility to pass only when there is some order in which and with which men can work to that end. All this applies to the possibility of greatest value. God is that order of existence and possibility which includes this possibility of greatest value to be attained, which makes it a possibility and in adjustment to which human effort is efficacious in achieving it, but without which human effort would be entirely futile and foolish. Human thinking and human effort are ingredients in the order of God, and help to make it.

There are many different orders of existence and possibility. Whether all these orders can be reduced to one single all-inclusive order is highly doubtful. The best thinkers to-day are inclined to deny that it can be done. But in any case, God cannot be identified with any such all-inclusive order. God is that one order which sustains and mediates the possibilities of greatest value. This order which is God is partly an order of existence and partly order of possibility.

Here, then, is the definition of "ideal" and "God." The ideal is some possible existence of greatest value which the human race may achieve either progressively or ultimately. "God," on the other hand, means that order of existence and possibility in dependence upon which and in conformity to which and in promoting which this ideal is to be achieved. Any structure of possible existence can be a possibility only because there is even now in the present process of existence an order which makes it a possibility. God is that order. But God is not limited to existence. He also includes possibilities. He is not the all-inclusive cosmic order or "the" order of nature, but he is that one particular order of nature, both existent and possible, which includes and mediates the greatest value that is to be achieved and without which that greatest value would not be a possibility at all and hence could not be a practicable ideal. It could only be a wishful fancy, a purely sentimental ideal.

Now, the question at issue between God and the ideal is this: Can we seek the ideal directly without regard to this order which is in the present process of existence and possibility and makes the ideal a possibility? Surely, there can be but one answer to such a question. The only way in which any unattained possibility can ever be achieved is by operating with that order by which it is brought to pass. Therefore, the only way the greatest values can ever be achieved is through God and in dependence upon God. To strive for the ideal and ignore God is like trying to make the sun stand still while ignoring the rotation of the earth. A religion that ignores God is as foolish as the man who thinks he can make the sun stand still without regard to the order which controls that event. Hence a religion which excludes God is a religion which reverts to magic and superstition, although it may profess to be the highest expression of science. Any striving after the ideal which ignores God, with this understanding of God, must be unintelligent, futile, and sentimental, because it is only through this order called God that the ideal can be achieved.

Therefore devotion to the supreme ideal must be devotion to God. Otherwise such devotion is mere sentimentality and gush. The only effective service we can render the high ideal is to serve that order which will actualize the ideal. We must serve this order in such a way that the greatest possible value will become progressively realized. The highest ideal may be infinite; but if so, it may be infinitely approached through God and in God, but in no other way.

GODLESS RELIGION

There are, however, two kinds of religion which can leave God out. But if the word "false" can be applied to any religion, it can be applied to these two. One of these has already been mentioned. It is that kind of religion which yearns toward the high ideal without trying to meet the conditions that must be met if anything effective is done to attain it. Such religion is futile aspiration, a gush of sentiment and nothing more.

The second kind of religion leaves God out in reality although it may not leave him out in name. Indeed, it may be more insistent about the name of God than any other. This kind of religion does not seek the highest possibility of value, but gives its devotion instead to some wishful fancy which is not a practicable possibility at all. Hence it does not need God except as a symbol to quicken the imagination. It does not depend upon any objective order through which the cherished possibility is to be realized, because the possibility is not practicable and can never be realized. Its sole value lies in being dreamed.

When we speak of the religion of wishful fancy, we do not refer merely to the fact that a man's idea of the highest genuine possibility of value may be incorrect, nor to the incorrectness of his idea of the order by which that possibility is mediated. Perhaps no man's idea of this order and of this possibility is without error. But there is a great difference between that religion which holds its ideas subject to correction in the light of further evidence, in other words tentatively, and that kind of religion which ignores evidence and insists that the highest possibility must be that which the individual or group happens most intensely to desire regardless of whether there is any order in the processes of existent and possible nature which makes it a possibility. Such a religion is godless, no matter how much it may use the name of God, because it ignores that order which is God. It does not constantly reformulate its ideas in light of what is discovered concerning such an order. Therefore, it seeks and serves and is devoted not to the order which is God, but only to its own ideas and desires, which it may call intuitions or revelations or inner experience or whatever title seems most glamorous.

Let us repeat that we do not deny that every religion has ideas which are mistaken. It may well be that every belief we use and profess, whether religious or secular, is infected with error. But there is a vast difference between holding ideas subject to correction and subordinate to the unexplored order of value, reformulating them in the light of all that we can discover, and, on the other hand, ignoring all such evidence and holding our ideas because of the inner satisfaction they yield or the infallibility we claim for them.

We must use the best ideas we have. They may be mistaken, but that does not make our religion godless if we are ready to discard our mistaken ideas just as soon as we discover they are mistaken. Such a religion will not believe anything without evidence, lest in so doing it depart from God and betray him. It will not accept as true any belief lacking evidence, no matter how essential it may seem for human welfare, for it knows that nothing is more harmful to human welfare than error, especially error concerning what is truly the highest possibility of value as distinguished from what is impossible. Therefore to believe what seems helpful simply because it seems helpful and without other evidence is to sin against that order which determines and constitutes whatever is truly and supremely helpful, namely, God.

The religion of wishful fancy sets up its own ideas of what is highest and best, and if there is nothing in the universe to indicate that these ideas represent genuine possibilities except the testimony of subjective desire and inner experience, they still are held. They may even be held when the weight of evidence is against them, and the religious devotee may even glory in the fact that he cherishes a faith that finds no support in reason or in the data of observation. But plainly such devotion cannot be devotion to the objective order which is God. It can only be devotion to subjective states. Dean Sperry has been quoted as saying that there is a kind of religion which consists in "wallowing in our own subjective states." Even if such ideas should be true, they could only be accidentally true and hence faithfulness to God would be an accident, which is not faithfulness at all. But he who will accept no belief on grounds of subjective need alone, but only on trustworthy evidence, is faithful to God even when he errs, for he is striving by the best means available to be true to God. And striving to be true is faithfulness.

RELIGION AT ITS BEST

We have two questions before us: first, What is the general nature of religion? and, second, What is religion at its best? We must now try to state what is the supreme function of religion at its highest. It is seeking and finding God, God being that order of existence and possibility which includes the possibilities of greatest value and is therefore himself the greatest value. This way of life has two requirements which are most important, and we can best describe it by specifying these requirements.

The first requirement is to recognize the fact that the order leading to highest possibilities of value, as well as these highest possibilities themselves, may be very different from our present beliefs, desires and ideals. This order, which we identify with God, which is not the all-inclusive order of nature, but is one order involved in the existence and possibilities of nature, may well be alien and even terrible to us. The reason that it should be so is that human beings have very recently (recently in terms of geological time) begun to communicate with symbols and so live a life sustained and controlled by the order which communication imposes.

This order which communication imposes is one in which the viewpoint of the individual is shared with others. It must be a shared or sharable viewpoint. Furthermore, the purpose which dominates the individual living under the order of communication must be a purpose which is shared, or at any rate sharable and to be shared as soon as temporary obstacles are removed. Likewise it is an order in which all the goods which the individual cherishes and strives to achieve are goods which are sharable or to be shared as quickly as hindrances are overcome. Thus the life which is shaped and dominated by communication is a communal life. It is a life in which the cause which the individual must serve with his whole life, and in which he finds all his satisfaction in life, is a cause which is common to all and to be served by all who communicate.

Why should the requirements of such an order of communication be alien and terrible to human beings? Why should the highest values which it offers be destructive to human kind? The answer to that question opens up the most important fact about human life and the profoundest truth which all the high religions have sought to declare. The answer is that human life is caught in the mesh and network of another kind of life which is alien to the requirements of this order of communication. This other kind of life is one in which the views of the individual are not sharable with others; in which the goods he cherishes are peculiar and private goods, excluding others; in which the cause to which the individual is devoted is not a common cause which others can serve with like devotion. These viewpoints, goods, and causes are not merely not shared, due to temporary obstacles, they are of such sort, or held in such a way, that they essentially preclude community or common sharing.

Whence comes this old life of exclusive goods, exclusive viewpoints, exclusive devotions? It is the natural way of life for all animals. It is the life that man has always lived. The new way of life demanded by the order of communication is an innovation superimposed upon the old way. The old way of life which all animals follow does certainly display co-operation and mutual help. But we are speaking of something over and above that. We are speaking of a sharing which can be achieved only by way of symbolical communication and is impossible through the use of mere signs. This old way of signs and mutual adaptive reactions without communication is the kind of life which we inherit from our whole geological past. It is the life of "the world" in one sense of that term. Ancient customs, ways of thinking and acting, constituting the unconscious habits of each generation, are transmitted to each new-born infant, and thus he is caught in the mesh of the old life before he is old enough to know anything about it.

Someone triumphantly rises to say: "Ah, but the whole difficulty can be overcome by education! All we need to do is to educate the young to live this other kind of life and all will be well." Such a suggestion is fatuous. Who is to do the educating? We adults are the only ones who can educate the young, and we already have this old way of life so deeply wrought into the habits of our minds and bodies that we cannot even approach the young without transmitting to them the old evil way of exclusive individuality.

What, then, can be done? The most important thing to be done is not to try to educate the young directly, for then we make them like ourselves; but, rather, it is to go ourselves in the way of high religion, the first requirement of which is to recognize that this order of greatest value is something quite alien and even terrible to the "natural man," because we are in great part shaped and dominated by the ancient order of exclusive goods, exclusive views, and exclusive devotions. As human beings our life is shaped by two orders which are alien and hostile to one another: one is the ancient order of all animal life, and the other is the order of that new way of life which communication imposes. Thus we are dual creatures, caught between the conflicting demands of two orders. We cannot extricate ourselves from either one. Thus we are torn. We constantly suffer "crisis."

The second requirement which must be met in order to seek and enter more fully into the communal life imposed by communication is to dedicate ourselves to that higher order. We must do this even when we do not know very much about the nature of it, because our participation in it is so meager and distorted by the animal way of living. We do not even know what the values are which this order will yield when we most fully conform to it. We only know that values to be found in that order are incomparably superior to the values of the old animal way of living. We know that by reason of whatever meager participation we have had in the higher order. But in dedicating ourselves to this order of the communal life we are giving ourselves to something which is in great part transcendent, unexplored, and unknown. Furthermore, it is an order which, in so far as we enter it, must crush and destroy the old way of life with all the goods which we have cherished so fondly in it. Furthermore, since it is an order which is so largely transcendent, and so much beyond the scope of our present experience, we can only seek it by experimental ventures in living which will be very painful and costly. Most of our present way of life must be wrecked, if we are to conform to the requirements of this communal order of greatest value. Hence we must in great part be broken and destroyed before we find our way into it. That is the reason passionate self-dedication to it is necessary. It must be a religious quest. We must be able to find in our very failures and self-destruction the manifestation of the presence and working in human life of this higher order.

Some may object to our assertion that human life must undergo such great pain and destruction before it can conform to the order which leads to greatest values. Their objection will be to point to the large part which communication already plays in our lives. Why, then, must human life undergo such radical reconstruction to meet the requirements of the order of communication? Our reply is that while communication does play a large part in our lives, we have not met the requirements of the order of greatest value which it offers. We communicate, yes, but we do not live in such a way as to find the highest values which communication makes possible. We communicate so much that we can never extricate ourselves from the order of communication; but at the same time we do not follow that way to the highest which communication opens to us. We live as members of two orders which are mutually hostile to one another. We must dedicate ourselves to one or to the other.

We cannot continue to live this life which clings to both. Hence self-dedication to the unknown requirements of the order of communication which leads to and which includes the greatest values, is the second requirement of the method we are considering. This dedication must be so complete and so passionate that the pain and destruction and death which it incurs will be experiences in which we apprehend and enjoy the object of our devotion.

This order of greatest value which transcends our present mode of existence, but is opened to us through the fact of communication, is so contrary to our way of life that no one can live as we live and at the same time reach far toward this order of value without being broken. Therefore, the loftiest fulfillment of human life is inevitably tragic. There can be no great loftiness in the human ways of existence without rendering this conflict of the two orders so acute as to be terrible. He who commits himself to the highest order of value while still living in the clutch of the lower order must be torn to pieces. Therefore the destruction and failure of the highest ventures is what reveals most clearly and brings down into our existence most effectively that order of greatest value which is opposed to our way of life. Because of the conflict between the two orders which shape our living, the only way to draw near to the order which is God is by way of tragedy. This has been dimly forecast by most of the great religions, and the Barthians are reiterating it to-day. Wherever that order which is God begins to be potent in our life there are death and destruction and the rending of the structure of our existence. The reason for this is that the order of highest value is so contradictory to our established order of existence that it cannot enter our existence without changing it radically. To change it radically means to destroy it. Thus, any approach to God brings to an issue the tragic opposition of these two orders and the urgency of final choice.

Can we state in very simple language what we believe is the nature of this order which is God? Yes, we can describe it in very ancient and very simple language. It is the order of love. To some that may sound paradoxical after all we have said about the suffering involved in passing from our present state of existence into it. But he who has followed our thought will see that it is not paradoxical. To use our own language, this order of greatest value is the order of communication. It is that order in which and through which men can achieve a communal vision and a united good in which each individual finds in all his living the meaning and the value of the whole march of life. But it is an order of which we are still very ignorant, for we have scarcely begun to explore it and it is mostly hidden from us by the old order of mutual adaptation through signs rather than symbols, in which there may be co-operation, but no community.

In saying that God is the order of love we have made a simple statement. But every simple statement about the nature of God is necessarily an inadequate and onesided statement. An adequate statement would have to be enormously complex. Indeed, no man is able to make an adequate statement. Therefore, the statement in the preceding chapter about the nature of God is scarcely more than suggestive.

To search out this order which is God and to bring to light the supreme but hidden possibilities of value that are in it, we must learn to live on that border line which marks the beginning of a realm of possibilities which are yet to be known, a realm of quest, where none may lead and none may guide and none has found the way, but where the radiant and ultimate values lie. This border line between possibilities known and possibilities unknown is where the great discoveries and insights are achieved. This is the line where spiritual growth takes place. This is the spiritual frontier of history.

Religion of the kind we would support is striving to find and to conform to that order in which alone human life can find its fulfillment and its deliverance from the chaos and the horror which must attend communicating personalities who cannot trust one another.

Life and the movement of life toward highest values are sustained and promoted not by any single factor alone, such as air or sunshine, or the biological process of organic cells, or the interaction between organisms, or the social heritage, or economic production, or artistic creation, or scientific investigation, or any other such list of factors taken severally and separately. Any of these alone and also the total sum of them are insufficient to constitute that upon which we are dependent and to which we must conform to bring life to its highest. But a very special order and process of interaction between all these different factors does sustain and promote the highest values of life. This order and process of interaction is more or less approximated in actual fact. This approximation, together with whatever degree of complete actualization in the future history of existence it may make possible, is God. Progressive integration may or may not be a satisfactory description of it.

This order and process of interaction between many factors, some of which we know and some of which we do not, is the unmistakable presence of God in our midst. The supreme intellectual problem of our existence is to get more accurate knowledge of the precise nature of this interaction; and the supreme practical problem is to conduct human life in conformity to its requirements. Hence God is the proper object of supreme devotion for all human living when living is intelligent.

CHAPTER VII

LIFE AND SCIENTIFIC METHOD

THERE is an established method by which we test the truth of any proposed belief. Manifestly, the only way that truth can ever be attained is by testing our beliefs by the right method and thus ascertaining which of them are true and which are false. If we do not verify our accepted beliefs, discarding those which cannot be verified, it is plain that we cannot know what the truth is. For to know the truth means to know what beliefs are true and what false. We can cherish theories that have not been verified, but we must not accept them as beliefs until the weight of evidence, gathered by some reliable method, points to their truth. If we do not follow this rule it is plain that we shall deceive ourselves with fabrications. When we speak of verified beliefs we mean beliefs that are supported by sufficient evidence to justify us in accepting them and living by means of them.

THEORY AND BELIEF

It is very important, however, that we have a vast system of theory which is not verified and not believed, but is held simply as theory. The danger always is that such a system of theory will be accepted as belief. To accept it as belief is folly. But the great value of it as pure theory has been demonstrated by the history of human thought. No great discoveries are ever made, and no advance in human understanding, unless there is a system of theory ready to catch and give meaning to any novel observation or suggestion that may arise. Millions of people had seen apples fall to the ground, but Newton had a system of theory in mind, inherited from previous thinkers and further elaborated by himself.[1] Because of this theory he caught a cosmic meaning in the apple which he could never have discovered without these speculative theories. The marvelous development of scientific knowledge and control of nature during the last three centuries is due to the fact that there had been previously developed an enormous system of theory, of which the mathematical systems on the one hand and the scholastic systems of thought on the other, together with the inheritance from Greece, were among the most important.

There are two things which block all progress and make it impossible to apply intelligence to the conduct of life. One is to accept a traditional system of theory as true before it has been verified. The other is to refuse to develop a system of theory unless it can be tested or otherwise applied to the practical conduct of life. Theories must be developed far beyond any observable use they may have, but they must not be believed until evidence supporting them has been gathered by the right method. The evil of accepting these speculative systems of theory as though they constituted metaphysical reality is the constant warning of John Dewey. But his emphasis upon this evil has led him to make statements that seemed to ignore the indispensable value of such speculative systems when they are treated purely as theory and not as constituting or describing any other sort of reality.

---

[1] Cf. A. N. Whitehead, *The Function of Reason*, pp. 56ff.

Many theories in the form of speculative systems have had to wait for centuries before they could be used to increase our knowledge or serve any practical end. But after hundreds or thousands of years there comes at last the time when without these theories certain discoveries of crucial importance could never have been made. Some problem arises which cannot be solved unless such theories are known to the people concerned. It is not so much that these predeveloped theories can be directly applied to the problem. Rather, they serve to guide the mind in its working so that it hits upon the theory which the specific problem requires. Without the guidance of the speculative system the mind would simply flounder and get nowhere.

In order to seek knowledge or any other good thing intelligently, two things are needed. One is the guiding idea variously called the hunch, the theory, the intuition, the insight, the suggestion, the clue, the lead. The other is a method by which to test and apply the idea so that it will yield knowledge or whatever else is sought. Of these two needs the more important, because most difficult to attain, is the guiding idea. Without it nothing can be done except to flounder about. And yet there is no reliable method by which to make the mind yield up an illuminating idea when it is needed. Sometimes the required idea comes to the mind and sometimes it does not, and there is no sure way of making it come. Some minds, however, seem to produce such ideas much more readily and abundantly than others. An individual having such a mind is called a genius. We call him a genius because we do not know how to make a mind function that way. A man either has that kind of a mind or he has not, and that is all there is to it. Yet these guiding, illuminating ideas are the most precious creations of the human mind, for without them we can get nowhere.

Because these original ideas are so precious we must conserve them. We must conserve them even when we see no use for them. That is the reason speculative systems of theory are so valuable. They conserve original and illuminating ideas so that they can be perpetuated and accumulated through the centuries and thus provide each generation with an arsenal of theoretical weapons which can be drawn upon in time of need. A mere jumble of original ideas is of no importance. An insane man can produce that. The ideas must be systematized according to the principles of reason. Hence a traditional and growing system of theory is of supreme value. But, like everything of great value, when it is misused it becomes one of the greatest of evils. The misuse of such a system of theory consists in believing it to be true without subjecting it to the only method by which the truth of a theory can be ascertained.

We have said that the creation of novel and valuable ideas by the mind is a mark of genius, because it cannot be cultivated or acquired. But that is not altogether true. While some minds seem to be much more highly endowed than others in this respect, something can be done about it. Any man can improve his mind somewhat in this respect. Two things can be done. We have already suggested them. One is to master as much as possible some traditional system of theory. When the mind is under the control of such a system of theory, it is much more likely to bring forth helpful suggestions in time of need, provided, of course, that the system of theory which dominates the mind has any relevance at all to the problem. A very simple illustration of this is the case of mathematics. The multiplication table is a system of theory. He who has mastered it will be able to think of many helpful suggestions in a pinch which a man not acquainted with it could never imagine.

The second thing that can be done to promote the creative imagination so that guiding suggestions will arise in the mind in the face of difficult problems is that method of solving problems which was described in the first chapter and which was called worshipful problem-solving.

WHAT IS SCIENTIFIC METHOD?

But what we wish chiefly to discuss here is not the method of cultivating the creative imagination, but, rather, the method of testing the guiding idea after the creative imagination has produced it. This method has no satisfactory title. It is sometimes called the scientific method or again the experimental method. Some call it the method of reason and others the empirical method, although the rational and empirical methods are sometimes so interpreted as to be put in contrast to one another.

The chief objection to calling it the scientific method is that many people immediately think of the techniques of physics and chemistry whenever reference is made to scientific method. When they hear anyone speak of scientific method, they automatically utter the words "test tube" and "physical laboratory." Of course one can limit scientific method to the techniques of these particular sciences and exclude all the other sciences. There is no law against using the word in that restricted sense. But it is very plain that the method by which any idea must be tested to ascertain what measure of truth it has, cannot be limited to the techniques of these two sciences. If this is the only proper use of the term "scientific method" we must get some other word to designate the basic principles of method by which any belief or theory whatsoever must be tested.

The objection to "experimental method" is similar. Experiment connotes to many minds the very restricted experiments which must be performed under laboratory conditions. That would exclude, for example, the method by which we learn how to tie a bow tie while peering into a mirror. Yet one certainly must experiment if he is to learn with any intelligence how to tie his cravat while facing a mirror. So likewise with innumerable other problems of everyday life and of extraordinary life. Yet if one insists that experimental method applies only to the techniques of certain special sciences, then there is nothing for it but to abandon the term and invent another to refer to the method we have in mind.

The objection to calling this method the method of reason is that reason means to many people the building up of propositions with logical consistency, but without any attempt to test them by observation through the senses or by physical operations of any sort. But the method by which truth is reached in any department of life, in the sciences, in moral conduct, in religion, in social relations of friendship or anywhere else, most emphatically is not purely a matter of armchair speculation. Meditation and logical consistency most certainly are necessary, but they are not sufficient. The actual doing of things, and observation of what happens when things are done, are likewise indispensable. Where such behavior and such observation are lacking there can be no knowledge, for without them it is impossible to distinguish between those ideas that are true and those that are not. And this applies to all discovery of values and orders of value quite as much as it applies to physics and chemistry. Gandhi, for example, is this day trying to bring to light that order of highest value in which human life can have any part. But he could never throw any light upon the problem of values to be sought and attained in human life if he did not do something. It is true that there is a division of labor in this matter, some men taking over more of the active side of the undertaking and others more the thinking side. But there must be both if there is to be any truth or any intelligence in the search for any good thing which possibility and existence may have to offer.

This method by which all good things must be sought when they are sought intelligently, which we can leave unnamed in order not to offend or cause misunderstanding, but which has been called the scientific method, the experimental method, and the method of reason—this method can be analyzed into four steps.

(1) Forming an idea of what course of action will produce specified consequences by observing various consequences that have issued from specified conditions. This first step is the most difficult of all. It is here that the greatest genius is displayed, not only in religion, but in the sciences and in every branch of life where discovery is demanded. The great religious personalities of history are they who have made most illuminating suggestions concerning what course of action will lead to the highest values. It might be said that all genius consists in hitting on these suggestions, whether in religion or government or science or art or wherever it be. The life and teachings of Jesus constitute such a suggestion.

(2) Ascertain as accurately as possible just what are the conditions under which this course of action can be profitably followed to produce the desired and anticipated consequences.

(3) Find or create these conditions, perform the course of action, and observe what happens.

(4) Develop by logical inference what further to expect in the light of what has been observed to happen and test these inferences just as the original idea was tested, namely, by steps one,

two, and three just described. These further operations and observations should include negative cases, that is, cases in which the absence of certain conditions brings about the absence of specified consequences.

There is one prerequisite, however, which must always be observed in trying to apply this method. He who applies the method should be one who is most familiar with the field in which the investigation is made. He who searches out that phase of the order leading to greatest value which appears in politics should be an experienced politician. He who would do the same in business must be an experienced business man. He who would apply it to the problems of love and marriage, children and the home, must be struggling with such problems. So in every walk of life.

Experience Is Not Knowledge

Why cannot this method be called the empirical method? Certainly that is as good a name for it as any and there are many who so refer to it. But the chief reason why we must be on our guard in calling it the empirical method is because this leads to the most disastrous misunderstanding of all. The great confusion and misunderstanding that has arisen through the use of this term is all the more dangerous because it is hidden. The hidden evil is revealed when people who object strenuously to applying the scientific or experimental or rational method to moral and spiritual interests are quite ready to accept what they call the "empirical method." But the reason they are willing to accept it is because they mean something wholly different from the method designated by the other terms mentioned.

The empirical method, when used in religious circles, has frequently meant the method described and defended by Canon Streeter in his *Reality* as the way to achieve knowledge of the realm of value and especially of matters that concern religion. But this is something totally different from the fourfold method we have described. It is based on the assumption that the quality of my experience reveals the nature of the thing I am experiencing. This is not correct. The fact that I experience a certain quality is no evidence at all that the quality I experience pertains to what I think it pertains to. Whether the quality I experience is the quality of "Reality" must be ascertained by the proper method, but the mere fact that I have the experience proves nothing at all. If I experience ecstasy when I hold a gold brick in my hand, the quality of my experience is no evidence at all that the brick is genuine gold. If I have been taught from earliest infancy to react to the figure of Jesus with awe and reverence and even ecstasy, the quality of my experience is no evidence that Jesus reveals the uttermost nature of "Reality."

Often the "empirical method" as defended by exponents of religion has rested on the claim that when we experience anything we have knowledge of it simply because we experience it. But experience does not yield knowledge at all unless it is subjected to the right method. The method of getting knowledge, therefore, must not be identified merely with experiencing the matter in question. The method is not the experience. The method is the way we deal with the experience. If I experience good health, I do not therefore know what good health is. The doctor may know far more about what good health is, than I, although he may be a sickly man while I am exuberantly healthy. Furthermore, he never has that immediate and intimate experience of my good health which I have, even though he may have intimate experience of his own health. But this intimate experience of mine gives no knowledge at all unless it is subjected to the right method.

One may reply that my intimate experience of good health certainly gives me one kind of knowledge that the doctor and no one else can have of my own personal good health. This esoteric knowledge of my own good health which I alone can have, so it is claimed, is the knowledge of how it feels. But even this is a mistake. I do not know how my own good health feels unless I apply that method by which all knowledge is gained. My intimate experience of my own health gives me no advantage at all unless I make use of this same method which all may use. I have access to experience which no one else has, therefore, if I apply the right method, I may obtain knowledge of my own health that no one else can gain. But the mere fact that I am experiencing my health as no one else can experience it, will never give me this knowledge unless I use this method. For example, suppose a man has had excellent health all his life. He does not on that account know how good health feels, for he may never have distinguished from all his other feelings that one particular kind of feeling which represents good health and therefore does not know the distinctive quality of experience which is the feeling of health. Nevertheless, he has the feeling. It is an undiscriminated part or quality of his total experience, like a man's color blindness, of which he may be wholly ignorant. A healthy man will sometimes think he is sick, which proves our point. When he examines his feelings, he may be unable to distinguish from his total mass of feelings that particular feeling which is the feeling of health. It may be found by the right method, but until a man has been sick he has no standard of comparison by which to discriminate the particular feeling of good health.

The significance of this illustration of the feeling of health is that it reveals the fallacy of all claims that knowledge springs from experience without regard to any method other than having the experience. Stupidity is an experience, but the man who experiences stupidity may not know nearly so much about it as a man who is not stupid. Insanity is an experience, but the insane man does not necessarily know what insanity is nor even know that he is experiencing it. The good man experiences goodness, but he may not know that he is having the experience of being a good man because he may not know his own goodness. An evil man experiences his own evil, but he may think he is good. A strong man often does not know his own strength nor a weak man his weakness. Hence a man may experience what he does not know.

Experience does not yield knowledge although no knowledge can be had without experience. Experience is to knowledge as soil is to food. We can never have any food except by deriving it from the soil, directly or indirectly. We can never have any knowledge except by deriving it from experience, directly or indirectly. But the man who thinks all he needs to nourish him is soil will starve to death, and the man who thinks that all he needs for correct knowledge is experience will surely be engulfed in illusions. Illusions are just as much experience as anything else, but they do not yield knowledge unless the right method is applied to them. The right method, we believe, is the fourfold method described above.

SCIENTIFIC METHOD IN RELIGION

Religion has no way of attaining knowledge of God or of anything else save the method we have been describing, whether one calls it scientific or gives it some other name. There is no "religious experience" which can give knowledge to the man that has such experience unless he subjects it to this same method. There is no esoteric religious method of getting knowledge.

Some of the critics of religion, and perhaps even more of its defenders, have said that if religion has no peculiar access to knowledge of reality other than that which the scientific method provides, it becomes superfluous. It has no unique contribution to offer. The sciences can do the work that it has claimed to do much better than it has ever done. Therefore it is sawing away the only limb that supports it when it gives up any claim to knowledge over and above what can be gotten by the scientific method. Such an assertion we deny.

To make such a claim as that is as foolish as to say that since morality is now making use of the scientific method as once it did not, morality has become superfluous and can be abandoned, the sciences taking the place of morality. Or one might say that since political activity is now trying to apply the scientific method as once it did not, all political organization becomes superfluous. It ceases to have any unique function to fulfill in life. Or it can be said that education is using the scientific method, or beginning to try to do so, but that when it does, it will cease to have any distinctive work to do. The fallacy is manifest. There are many different functions of human living, all equally essential. When a function of life begins to employ the scientific method, it does not thereby cease to exist as a distinctive function. It has simply begun to use a more efficient method for testing the truth of the beliefs which it must use in doing its own distinctive work.

Furthermore, it is an error to think that morality and religion, politics, education, and the other major interests of life never made use of the method described until recent times. To be sure, this method when used in other times may never have been called scientific until the sciences arose. Also it may never have been clearly defined and distinguished from mistaken methods. But in so far as any reliable knowledge was ever attained, long before the special sciences arose, this method was employed in morality, religion, education, politics, and elsewhere. It was doubtless applied in a slipshod manner, and it was mixed with much that was mistaken or purely superfluous. Doubtless today, since this method has been defined and is recognized as the only right method, all these interests use it more rigorously and exclusively than ever before. But it has been used in some crude fashion since men first began to acquire any knowledge at all.

If religion is limited to the method described for all the knowledge it can get, does it follow that he who is deeply religious can know nothing save what others likewise know? No, that does not follow. The fact that the religious man must use the same method as the unreligious man does not at all imply that the knowledge which the religious man has is limited to the same boundaries as the knowledge of the unreligious man. The use of the method described in no way prescribes the kind of knowledge that is gotten by means of it. It only shows the way to get any kind of knowledge whatsoever. But the kind of knowledge we get depends on what we investigate. And what we investigate is determined by what arouses our interest. He who uses this method in physics will not discover the same facts as he who uses it in chemistry. He who uses it in biology or politics or friendship or education will in each case get different knowledge from the others, because he is investigating different data. So, also, when this method is used under the control of the religious interest, it will bring to light facts which cannot be found in other fields of investigation. He who uses this method to search out the order that includes and leads to the greatest values will certainly discover facts, if he discovers anything at all, which will be very different from what another discovers who applies the same method to totally different matters.

The religious man has access to phases of experience which the unreligious man can never know, not because he uses a different method of gaining knowledge, but because he has an interest which makes him receptive and responsive to phases of existence and possibility for which the unreligious man has no sensitivity. This rôle of personal attitude in gaining access to data relevant to some problem is not peculiar to religion. A friend will gain knowledge about the person for whom he has affection which another cannot gain, because he will detect and elicit data which the other cannot detect and cannot elicit. A man who is interested in flowers will discover facts about them which a man not interested will not discover. A man interested in dogs or horses or chemical reactions has access to data which another without that interest can never reach. This is partly because his attention is focused in the required direction as the other's is not. It is also because he will do things toward the object of interest which the other man would never do, and thus elicit reactions which reveal the nature of the flower or chemical compound or dog or friend or whatever may be that aspect of reality under consideration.

This peculiar access to knowledge of reality which the interested man has and the uninterested has not, is not merely due to high proficiency in operating the special technique which that aspect of reality may require. Mere technical expertness is not enough. Neither is it due solely to curiosity. One may have intense curiosity, but if he does not find delight in doing the things which elicit the revealing reactions from the subject matter under consideration, he will not gain the knowledge which another would gain concerning it. A man may be very curious about chemistry, but if he does not find the chief joy of his life in fooling with chemical compounds, he will not gain the knowledge of chemistry which another will gain who does find greatest joy in that. So also the man who loves dogs or flowers will gain what might be called an esoteric knowledge of them if the ruling passion of his life consists in reacting to them. That does not mean that mere delight in dealing with an object will give knowledge of it if one does not employ the method by which alone knowledge can be attained. All the ecstasy in the world which one may experience in dealing with an object will give him no knowledge of it, but may, rather, intensify his illusions concerning it, if he does not use the method which yields knowledge. But the method which yields knowledge will yield a depth and range of knowledge, an esoteric knowledge, in the hands of him who is passionately devoted to the object under consideration, which cannot be gotten by another using the same method who does not have this attitude of intense interest.

All this applies to the object of religious devotion as much as to anything else. Mere passionate devotion will yield no knowledge at all and may lead to fantastic illusions. But when passionate devotion is combined with the most rigorous use of the very best methods of eliciting and detecting relevant data, of verifying theories and correcting errors, then the religious man will acquire knowledge of that order of existence and possibility to which he is devoted that another man cannot acquire. Therefore the religious individual or group, providing the rightful method of seeking knowledge is used, will attain a depth and scope of knowledge concerning the object of devotion which is wholly out of the reach of any other. Also, in addition to knowledge, they will gain a wealth of experience of this object which is not knowledge, but is equally precious. In case of the best religion, which we have called high religion, this object is that order of existence and possibility which provides the highest values which can be actualized relative to existent conditions.

THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

It must not be thought that this knowledge of God, because it must be sought and achieved by the method described, is necessarily limited to men of unusual intellectual attainments. All knowledge is attained by this method, but all knowledge is not limited to unusual people. The commonest sort of people have knowledge of dogs and flowers and their own children which they get by this method, although they do not necessarily call it scientific or distinguish it as a special method of any sort. Knowledge with the specialized sciences can be brought to light only by a very complex and highly artificial technique. Hence only experts can employ it. But there is other knowledge equally precious and rare which is difficult not because of an elaborate technique that is demanded, but because of an attitude and interest which are uncommon. Without this interest and attitude the relevant data cannot be elicited and detected. There are data concerning trees and flowers and children and men and women which can be gotten only when the searcher has a very intense and special kind of interest.

There are, in fact, three kinds of knowledge which can be gotten by means of this method we are considering, which one may refuse to call the scientific method, but which ought to have some name. These three kinds of knowledge are distinguished by the kind of data to which the method is applied. It is this difference in data, by the way, which also distinguishes the several sciences even when they all make use of the same basic principles of method. These three kinds of knowledge are: (1) the knowledge which goes to make up the several sciences; (2) the knowledge called common sense; (3) the most rare and precious knowledge which simple folk seek and find by reason of their loving devotion to the object under investigation. Let us illustrate these three kinds of knowledge by a special case.

Here is a small boy. We can gather knowledge about him by means of the several sciences. The physicist, either professional or amateur, can tell us his size and weight, the electrical reactions of his body, and many other valuable bits of information. The biologist can describe him as a system of biological functions. The psychologist, according to the school of psychology to which he belongs, will give us some more specialized knowledge concerning abstract aspects of the boy. Finally, the sociologist will tell us the sociological principles exemplified in the boy's conduct with respect to the "gang," his home, the school, and so forth.

But all this knowledge, however valuable, is not sufficient to enable anyone to take proper care of the child. If he were never fed until scientifically accurate knowledge had been obtained each time concerning just what kind and quality of food he most needed on this particular occasion; if he were never warmed or sheltered until all relevant knowledge of the sciences involved had been in each case gathered; if he were not pulled from in front of the automobile until all physical principles had been firmly established concerning the necessary stresses and strains, the boy would die.

There is a kind of common-sense knowledge indispensable to the care of a child, and every good nurse is master of it. It is gathered by developing a system of ideas through noting conditions and consequences. When certain conditions arise, anyone equipped with this system of ideas which we call common sense knows what the child needs and will act accordingly. Anyone at all good in caring for a child will have developed such a system of guiding ideas according to the fourfold method previously described which, for lack of a better name, we call the scientific method. He will have done it even though he may never know that scientific method is the name for it. But one thing is certain: the old notion that the "intuition of mother instinct" is sufficient, is a fallacy. If the mother or any other trusts to "intuitions" and "inspirations" without regard to the conditions, and the consequences which ensue, the child will surely die. Many a child has thus been slaughtered in love.

But there is another kind of knowledge of the child which is neither that of the sciences nor that of common sense. For common sense the child is an urchin to be fed and clothed and spanked as needed. But to the eyes of love he is a personality with whom to establish a profound community through communication and mutual understanding. How is this knowledge called community or mutual understanding to be attained? By going into raptures over the child? By being filled with emotion? Do we get it by "inner experience"? Do we need simply to follow the dictates of the heart without regard to the data of observation? No, indeed. There are parents who love in this blind and fatuous manner and think that "deep experiences" give them knowledge of the mind of the child. But they are mistaken. Their love is blind. They do not achieve any mutual understanding with the personality of the child. They do not elicit his personality. They only know an idealized figure, a construction of their own fond imagination. Many a stranger more observant than they could tell them things about the mind of that child which they have never dreamed and which it is urgently important that they know. Yet they never come to know. Why? Because they do not employ the method previously described by which all knowledge must be sought and found. They trust to their "intuitions" and to their "deep inner experience," to the dictates of the heart unchecked by attentive and tender and never-failing observation of conditions and consequences.

How does the wise and observant and loving mother come to know the mind of her child? By the same method, used by the scientist and the nurse, of common sense—by observing conditions, acting experimentally (which includes speaking) and observing the consequences. How, then, is her knowledge so different from theirs? Because she has access to different data. She looks at the child through the eyes of love. Her whole personality is tuned and set to respond to the slightest stimulus emanating from the child. She catches the slightest change in the tone of his voice. The swiftest tensing of the muscles of his face strikes her soul. A gleam, a movement, a touch of the hand, a stir of the body—they all are hers. And then—she ponders these many things in her heart. She ponders these many things until at last the personality of her child grows upon her.

She has noted what reactions occur when she says or does certain things under certain conditions. She has made her inferences and then acted or spoken further and noted the further consequences. Furthermore, the child directs his reactions to her. He opens up to her as a flower to the sun. She has access, we say, to data which no other can have. These data will teach her nothing if she merely receives them as stimuli for arousing her emotions and giving her a "deep" inner experience. These experiences may be very delightful, even ecstatic. They may give her joy and peace and deep contentment with her lot. But she will never know the personality of her child, and will probably ruin him, heart, mind, and body, unless she notes what causes him to react this way rather than that, and what follows further after these initial reactions. If she does not use the method described, she will never attain that community of mind which is the most precious knowledge of the child, although she may experience raptures within her own soul, the while her child goes to the devil.

Here, then, we have the three kinds of knowledge—that of the sciences, that of common sense, and that of love. All must be obtained by the same basic principles of method. They differ because of the difference in data with which they deal. Physics has its peculiar data and so do biology and sociology. Common sense has still other data. But the loving heart finds vast richness of concrete data which are quite inaccessible to the sciences and to common sense. Out of these data it may build itself a mansion of knowledge in which two personalities may dwell together in mutual understanding. But it cannot do this if it does not use the right method, no matter how great the love, no matter how richly concrete the data, no matter how exalted the inner experience.

These three kinds of knowledge, that of the special sciences, that of common sense and that of loving devotion, must be obtained by the same basic principles of method, we have said. This method consists in acting experimentally upon certain interconnections of events until we have established a system of connections between events so that we can act in such a way as to get certain desired consequences. But in the sciences this method has achieved a triumphant fulfillment far beyond anything found at the levels of common sense and devotion. That is to say, we have applied the method in the sciences in such a way as to establish a system of connections vastly greater in scope, accuracy and communicability than has ever been done at the levels of common sense and devotion. By communicability we mean that the system of operations can be taught to others.

Why have we not developed such scope, accuracy, and communicability at the devotional level? There are several reasons. One is that the devotional level has such rich, qualitative fullness of experience, such richness of value, that the complexity has thus far baffled our infant science. Consequently, we have no system of operations which can guide us in cultivating a friendship that can compare with the accuracy, scope, and communicability of the system which guides us in building a bridge. Another obstacle has been the refusal of men to admit that this experimental or scientific method can be applied at this level. If men can be induced to recognize that at this level of richest experienced values the same basic principles of operational method must be applied as in physics, with whatever modification may be required by the different data involved, then the way will be open to increase indefinitely the accuracy, scope, and communicability of the operations by which we seek and find these richest values of life.

Scientific method in religion means precisely the endeavor to develop such a system of operations by means of experimental efforts. There is not much hope of doing this as long as certain traditional misconceptions distort the judgment and divert the energies of religious people. These misconceptions pertain to religion, to science, to scientific method, to value, to knowledge and how it is obtained, to reality, to God. There is crying need for thinkers who are competent to clear away these misconceptions and thus set free from enslavement, and release into this great enterprise, the intelligence and total resources of religious and potentially religious people. Only if these misconceptions are cleared away is it possible to undertake with some hope of success the great search of man for that order of existence and possibility by which alone we can ever hope to increase and to secure to the utmost the richest values of life.

We can make bridges with marvelous skill. But we still bungle our attempts at friendships, creative association, education, æsthetic appreciation, political organization, and economic justice. To find God, as we are using the term, is to find that order, as yet in great part an undiscovered possibility in the realm of essence, which will enable us, when we rightly adjust to it, to achieve these richest values in greater measure and regularity than now. God is not merely possibility. He is also partly existential. The order of God includes certain possibilities and certain features of existence.

In the meantime, while scientific method in religion lags, simple and devoted souls discover what others cannot see, not because of any magic, not because of anything supernatural, not because of some organ of the soul peculiar to themselves, not because of some strange kind of intuition, but simply because they are sensitized by love and note what happens under certain conditions when they do and say certain things. They perceive through the same identical senses through which we perceive. Furthermore, they perceive and get their data through the external senses, not through any kind of internal sense, except, of course, the ordinary kinæsthetic and other interoceptive organs of the human organism, the same as we. Having hearts more quick than the rest, they discern what others do not. But there is no magic in this save the magic of loving devotion. Their way of knowing is the way of all flesh. They are very simple and very naïve and merely open their eyes to all the world as a child might do if he were sufficiently mature, and had a heart of love. They are very, very simple, these saints, almost absurdly simple. They are generally considered fools, for they seek that which in the light of our established order of existence is folly. They are not necessarily equipped with great learning nor with great intellects.

Observation of the conditions and consequences of the ever-repeated attempts of men through the ages to find the good life which is supremely good seems to make one fact plain. This supreme good can be attained only as men share their experiences, their visions, their techniques, their materials, their insights, their discoveries. Only through communication, through the stimulating interchange of ideas and inventions and through deep community of heart and mind do the Orient gates unlock to spacious days that dawn. It is this that saints and sages see with simple and devoted hearts. We must develop a system of operations to achieve it more widely and enduringly.

CHAPTER VIII

PERSONALITY

PERSONALITY is that which communicates and hence which shares experience. Such being the case, a single isolated personality is impossible. To be sure, a Robinson Crusoe can live in isolation, but he could never have developed into a personality without association with other individuals which were personalities or which could develop into personalities along with him. This conclusion follows from the fact that personality is that which communicates. Communication is impossible unless there are at least two, so that they can express themselves to one another and understand one another.

HOW PERSONALITY DEVELOPS

But if personality is that which communicates, personality develops along with communication. The difference between communication and the mutually adaptive reactions of two organisms was described in Chapter III. Communication requires symbols while mutually adaptive reactions require only signs. The difference between sign and symbol was illustrated in Chapter III by the two ways in which a man may shake his fist. In one case he is actually fighting, in the other case he is symbolizing a fight, hence not fighting, but communicating by means of a symbol.

The story of the development of personality is the story of the development of symbols and communication. Language represents our most elaborate system of symbols. When the organism in its interaction with the environment develops symbols and begins to communicate, it becomes a personality.

What is it about the human organism and its interaction with the environment which gives rise to communication and personality when other animal organisms do not develop any such characteristics? We shall try to list some of these features of the human organism and its interaction with environment which show why this kind of organism may develop personality while others do not. We shall not attempt to be thorough and accurate. The scientific investigation of this problem must be left to the experts in this field. Our analysis is designed merely to clarify what we mean by the development of personality rather than to try to give a scientific description of the genesis of it.

We are not so much interested in how the individual child develops into a personality. With communicating personalities all about him that is not so difficult. But the chief problem is to understand how personality could develop in the first place. That is to say, how could communication develop out of organic reactions which were mutually adaptive, but not communicative? For the development of personality, we repeat, is identical with the development of communication.

The first feature to note about the human organism is the big brain and complex nervous system. Then there is the formation of the human mouth and tongue which makes possible a great variety and multiplicity of vocalization. The great importance of this lies in the fact that these diversified sounds can serve as symbols. It is difficult to see how any great speed and diversification in the formation of symbols could be possible without such a tongue and mouth and the easy and varied sounds they produce.

These physiological characteristics provide favorable conditions, but they do not contribute anything positive toward the development of personality. For the great divide between animal and human, as we noted before, is the transition from sign to symbol. How can this transition be accomplished? How can signs be torn loose from the particular concrete situation in which they are embedded and be used to represent systems of relations in the abstract? That is the great problem. That alone can give rise to personality.

A physiological characteristic promoting that end is the hand and opposed thumb we find in man. This makes possible the dexterity and variety of manipulation required for tool making. As soon as anything is used as a tool we are well on the road to symbolized meaning. A tool is not organically embedded in any particular situation. It can be put into different situations, used by different people, and made to produce different consequences. Thus it becomes a sign which is detachable from any particular concrete situation and hence a kind of symbol.

Another characteristic of the human leading to the development of symbols is the complex and unspecialized nature of the organs of the human body which, together with the complex nervous system, gives rise to a great variety and plasticity of response. This makes conflict of responses almost unavoidable. Now, such conflict is very important in promoting the use of symbols, for such conflict makes us aware of certain characteristics in the total situation which seem to be opposed and mutually exclusive of one another. This mutual exclusiveness of two or more characteristics both pertaining to the same situation is on the border line of abstraction. If one set of characteristics excludes another, then it is easy to think of that set in abstraction from the other. If such a set in abstraction can be represented by a symbol, we have meaning that can be communicated.

The human organism seems to be endowed with many minor units of behavior that are loosely organized and not bound down to any one single biological function. Thus the way is opened to indefinite reconstruction and progressive development of human response, which further favors the development of many diverse meanings. These free impulses, released from any established biological routine, provide conflict, wonder, curiosity, and that modification of response which meaningful behavior carries with it.

There is the further notable fact of prolonged infancy and the relative undeveloped state of the human infant, making possible a great amount of learning and artificial remaking according to the requirements of an historic culture. But we must hasten to mention what we believe to be the most important factor in the development of symbols and consequently of personality.

This most important factor is another consequence of the prolonged helplessness of the human infant, but it is the effect of this helplessness upon the adults and not merely the possibility of rich development which it provides for the infant. Because of this helplessness of their offspring the parents and other members of the family are compelled to live together for long periods of time in most intimate and complicated association. This long-continued intimacy and delicacy of co-operation, combined with human powers of vocalization and the other conditions we have mentioned, must develop signaling to such a high degree and under such circumstances as to lead to symbols.

Consider an example of the kind of social interaction which might be most likely to lead from signaling and sign meaning to communication and symbolized meaning. Suppose I gather pebbles and hand them to another, he throws them to a third and the third catches them and puts them into a basket. Then we change places, I take the part of throwing and the others shift accordingly. Thus each learns the order of events as they transpire relative to each separate position. Consequently, when another assumes the rôle which I now fill and I take his position, his behavior may become for me something more than a sign of how I must adjust my conduct in adaptation to his. I have previously held his position and entered into the order of events from that standpoint. Hence I may read in his behavior the order of events as this order is implicated in his behavior. When I do this his behavior is no longer a mere sign stimulating me to make appropriate motions in adaptation to him. It becomes a symbol which represents a course of behavior which is not involved merely in my own situation and viewpoint. Rather, his behavior represents a total system of relations which is common to us all and into which anyone may enter who desires to play a part in the game. As soon as I am able thus to grasp a system of relations which applies indifferently to each and all, I have reached the level of communication and personality. When this happens the behavior of another, including the sounds he emits, can be more than signs stimulating me to make anticipatory adjustments to what will happen next. Now these sounds and other behavior can communicate to me a system of relations which we can all share in common. Thus we are able to develop a community, to share meanings, to build up by progressive integration an ever more elaborate and comprehensive system of relations by which to control the course of events and to experience more of the fullness of the world. Thus the individual can escape from the prison house of his own organism and the bearing of the immediate concrete situation upon his own body. Now he can view the world from a standpoint which is not peculiar to himself, but which can be assumed by anyone who is able to communicate with him about the matter. Thus it is a viewpoint which can be shared in common. And, what is equally important, this point of vantage can be made to command a survey and a control of more of the world progressively, because different individuals and successive generations can improve it and hand it on to the next with this added scope.

This organized co-operation in which human organisms learn to communicate, which we have illustrated by the throwing of pebbles, is forced upon the group of human adults by the necessity of caring for the young. All living organisms must co-operate more or less, but none is required to co-operate in such a complex and delicate operation, requiring such reconstructions of the system, as human adults in caring for their young. Thus the prolonged helplessness of the human infant, with the required organization and reorganization of adult co-operation, might well have been the chief factor in causing interaction between human organism and environment to pass over into the form of symbolic representation, or communication, thus producing personality, spirituality, and all human greatness.

Whether our description is a correct portrayal of how it all happened, may be questioned, but we contend that communication is what transforms a mere animal into a personality. The fruits of communication with symbols are: truth and the quest and prizing of truth, personal affection and the cultivation and enjoyment of affection, beauty and the appreciation and creation of beauty, political organization and economic exchange. These are also the distinctive marks of personality. Hence communication is what makes personality.

WHAT IS THE VALUE OF PERSONALITY?

The next question we must ask concerning personality is, What constitutes its value? It is common to say that personality constitutes the greatest value we know. It seems to us more accurate to say that personality is one component in that structure which constitutes greatest value. Our reason for saying this is that personality as a structure cannot stand alone. As we have seen, a personality cannot develop by itself. The interaction between organism and environment can develop into a personality only when there are two or more such organisms interacting with the physical world and with one another by means of symbols. The fact that personality essentially involves communication would seem to demonstrate this. After a personality has been developed, it may be isolated from other personalities so far as concerns physical proximity; but if this isolation is too long continued and is complete, so that all communication with other personalities is impossible, the personality shrivels. It becomes less and less of a personality. The individual approximates more and more to the status of a mere animal. And all the values which we have listed as the values associated with personality and meaning sink and fade.

So we say it is not any single individual personality that constitutes greatest value, but, rather, that order in which personality is one essential component and which fosters and develops personality. Thus the highest possible value, so far as we can see, would necessarily involve the most complete development of personality. But in no case would that value consist solely in personality, but, rather, in an association of communicating personalities along with physical conditions and symbols. Personality would be one factor, but not the whole.

So we believe it is better to say, not that personality is the greatest value, but, rather, that personality is a necessary component in the greatest value. The great value of personality, then, lies not in the fact that it is an end in itself, for it is not an end in itself. Rather, its great value lies in the fact that it is a means to an end. It is a means to the end of greatest value not in the sense of being outside of that greatest value, but, rather, in being one essential factor which must enter in to make it up. The greatest value is an association of personalities communicating with one another by way of physical conditions and symbols, and thus achieving truth, beauty, art, personal affection, moral goodness, and all the other great values. The greatest value, then, is not *a* personality, for *a* personality is an impossible abstraction. It is, rather, a society of personalities in which each personality as a member of the society makes the maximum contribution of which he is capable to that total structure which constitutes the supreme good. In this sense the value of personality lies in being a means and not in being an end, even though Immanuel Kant affirmed the opposite.

Take, for example, that which is considered one of the greatest of values, personal affection. Plainly, personal affection is not a personality. It is an association of personalities. It is that kind of association of personalities in which physical conditions and meanings are so adjusted with respect to two or more living organisms that there can be communication, mutual understanding, and integration of visions, mutual intensification of joys and mutual assuagement of sorrows and a common cause to serve. This structure constituting the value of personal affection is experienced by the personalities. But what each personality experiences is not merely himself. Neither is it merely the other personality. On the contrary, it is the total structure constituted by their association and involving physical conditions, meanings, and living organisms.

Hence the value of personal affection cannot be identified with personality, however indispensable personality may be to it. While personality is indispensable, it is no more indispensable than the physical conditions, the organisms, and the meanings. Indeed, personality is, we repeat, an impossible abstraction without these, just as a smile is impossible without a face.

What has been said about the value of personal affection is true of all the other great values associated with personality. In no case can they be identified with personality. Personality is simply one factor which enters into the total complex which constitutes them.

God Versus Personality

With this understanding of personality let us return to the question, Is God a personality? Perhaps all who entertain the idea of God will agree that God must be the supreme good or the greatest value. But we have seen that the greatest value cannot be a personality. Therefore God cannot be a personality. But please take note: We deny personality to God not because he has less value than personality, but precisely for the opposite reason. We deny personality to God because he must have greater value than any personality can ever have. A personality, as we have said, cannot stand alone. It is a mere abstraction. The greatest value is an association of communicating personalities together with all the highest undiscovered possibilities involved in such an association, to be actualized in the future.

As a matter of fact, this is what ancient Christian tradition has always affirmed in the doctrine of the Trinity. We do not want to resurrect the doctrine of the Trinity in its primitive form, nor, for that matter, in any form. We merely refer to it to point out that this recognition that personality is not the highest value is not something new in our Christian tradition. Many have spoken as though Christianity has always claimed that personality constitutes the greatest value. We cannot find that such is the case, not even in the case of Jesus. The kingdom of God was for him the greatest value in the form of possible existence. But the kingdom of God was not a personality. It was an association of communicating personalities. It could not exist without personalities. It could not even be a recognizable possibility of existence without personalities in existence. But it was not a personality. It was a structure made up of living organisms, physical conditions, and meanings. A kingdom of God which did not involve physical conditions, living organisms, and meanings is nowhere suggested by Jesus.

So we conclude that if God constitutes the greatest value, he cannot be a personality.

What, then, is God? Is he that possible structure of existence which constitutes the greatest value in the form of an ideal? No, for there is something which has even greater value than that possible structure of existence called the supreme ideal. This something having greater value includes the ideal, but is more. It is that order of actual and possible structures of existence which includes that ultimate consummation which Jesus called the kingdom of God. It is not the total cosmic order. It is not the order of nature, taking nature in its totality. It is that order of structures of value, actual and possible, which will ultimately issue in the realization of the greatest value when we rightly conform to its requirements. That is what God is. He is not merely a possibility. He is an order which includes both a part of actuality and a part of possibility. He is an order which is partially actualized in existence.

Some will object to applying the word "order" to God. It sounds so cold and barren. But that is due to the psychological connotation of the word. Some words are warm and vibrant with emotion because of the associations they carry. Other words are not. In worship and exhortation and in that thought and communication in which we are trying to develop certain personal attitudes these warm and glowing words should be used. Any others would be out of place. But when we are trying to get the most adequate concept we can of the truth, these glowing words of emotion are just as much out of place as the other kind are in love and worship. When they are introduced into the labor of intellectual inquiry, they confuse and befuddle. And inasmuch as they do thus lead our thinking astray they lead us into error which in the end will drive out our love and worship. Therefore, for the sake of love and worship, we must be able to use at the proper time and place these cold words with steely sharp edges that can cut their way through tangled confusion. That person who facetiously suggests that we address God in prayer as, "O thou order of structures of existence constituting value, present in the process of existence and including possibilities yet to be experienced as values, hallowed be thy name," may be funny or he may not. But in any case, he has missed the whole point of definition. He is trying to pray to a definition, which is plainly a hopeless confusion of thought. Such a person may be an excellent personal leader as a man among men, but he is not a competent thinker. He does not know how to distinguish between a definition and the reality defined.

Various arguments are advanced to justify the claim that God is a personality. One runs like this. I want a God with whom I can have fellowship, with whom I can share my sorrows and troubles as with a friend, with whom I can talk and who, perhaps, will talk with me. If God is not a personality who can give me this kind of fellowship, he is nothing to me. As a God he is worthless.

Anyone who makes such a statement as that is revealing the cloven hoof of a godless religion. Instead of subordinating his own desires to the end of discovering what in actual fact does constitute the greatest value, he takes the opposite course. He sets up his own desire as a model and then insists that God must be made in the image of that desire or else abdicate the status of God. Suppose one set up his uncultivated desires as standard for judging the literary merit of the works of Shakespeare. He finds that the jingles of the neighbor across the street satisfy his desire, but that Shakespeare, to his taste, is worthless. Therefore, these jingles are great literature while the works of Shakespeare are not.

Anyone who sets up his own uncultivated desire as standard of value for poetry or for good society or for the kind of person to have as a friend or for any other kind of value including God, is setting up a false standard. The greatest value must be that which we can experience as greatest value; but the desires which can find satisfaction in greatest value must be cultivated and disciplined and developed by criticism and by experimentation and by prolonged and ripened experience. Whatever God truly is, that he is; and anyone who refuses to consider anything as God save that which he happens most to desire, is the devotee of an idol because he is not even seeking for that which truly does constitute the order of value in devotion to which all men can find community and oneness of life. If God is a person who can talk with us, so he is; but the fact that I happen to desire that kind of a God is no evidence at all that God is truly of that sort.

Another argument advanced for personality of God is that only with such a God can we have personal relations. This also seems to be setting up our own personal preference as standard of what God must be. But it brings up a very important point which must be considered on its own merits.

What is meant by personal relations with God? Does this argument mean that if God is not a personality, we cannot find in God the kind of response we find in a personality? In one sense that statement is true, but in that sense it is a mere tautology. It is merely saying that if God is not a personality, he is not a personality. But if it means that we get no response from God, or if it means that the response we get from God is not as worthful as the response of a personality, then it is mistaken. For we do get response from God, and the kind of response we get from God far exceeds the value of any response which any personality could make. When we as personalities conform to the requirements of this order through which and in which the highest possibilities of value are realized, the world leaps forward toward the highest value. This kind of response constitutes far greater value than the personal comfort and consolation we might receive from a mere personality. It may not be what we want, but if it is not, may it not be because our wants are selfish and childish? To be mature means to lose our personal self-centered wants in devotion to the highest value that reality can offer.

Another claim put forward for personality in God is very different. It is scarcely an argument at all, yet it is often heard. It comes from the ecclesiastic and runs something like this: What you say about high devotion and forgetting yourself in the service of a cause may be all very true for the highly cultivated and rare individual. But the great mass of people cannot rise to that level. They cannot respond to a God such as you propose. It is the warm fellowship of a fatherly personality that they want, and if you do not give them that, you cannot do anything with them.

This, we repeat, is scarcely an argument. Of course we cannot construct a God to serve the needs of the common man. God is what he is. If the common man does not respond to God as he is, then shall we say, So much the worse for God, or, So much the worse for the common man? But we do not think it is necessary to say either one. It is not true that the common man is incapable of devotion to a cause in which personalities are subordinated rather than served. A great war is not a worthy cause, but in every great war we see common men by the thousand and the million rise up in self-dedication to a cause which they do not understand, but which they believe to be worthy of supreme devotion. The common retort is that they do it for the sake of wife and children and other personalities that are dear to them. But that is not true. They are willing to sacrifice wife, children, home and all, if the cause seems to them to be of vast import. Of course they know that they are serving something in which personalities are involved and doubtless believe that posterity will profit by their sacrifice. But these personalities are not intimate personal associates. They are simply a part of the order for which they live and die. Therefore we believe this plea for personality in God in order to awaken religious response in the common man is a libel on the common man.

The various arguments put forward to justify belief in the personality of God cannot all be considered here. We have mentioned the above more to suggest what is involved than to try to meet all the claims that might be put forth.

The real point of the whole issue is this: Man must find something greater than personality to serve. God is that something greater. The greatness of personality lies in the fact that it can serve that order of existence and possibility in which are found the greatest values that can ever be achieved. God is precisely that order. That order includes personalities, but is more than personality. Personalities together with symbolized meanings and communication are essential to the maximum realization of that order which is God and which constitutes the greatest value. That order is personal, if by that one means personalities are involved in it. But that is all that can be meant. Perhaps that is all that is needed to satisfy the craving of any human heart. But the craving of the human heart cannot be taken as standard for judging what God must be. If we did take such a standard, opium would be God for some craving human hearts, and bloody vengeance for others.

One last objection we must consider to the use of our word order as applied to God. Order seems to suggest something passive, inefficacious, that does nothing. But here, again, we believe, we have merely the psychological association of a word. As a matter of fact, there is nothing we can specify which is not an order. A personality is an order. So are a government and a pebble on the beach. Force, power, change, cannot be specified except by the order they assume. There is a process, a flux, a perpetual transition which Whitehead calls creativity. But this process of existence assumes various orders. When it does assume any one definite order, that order has power to do things and to make a difference because it is an order of change. That is the only way in which anything ever is done, namely, by some order which is exemplified in the process of existence. Therefore, order is not powerless or inefficacious when and in so far as it is the order of existence.[1] The order of value is not the only order of existence, but is one order of existence and as such has power to do things just as any order of existence has. Hence God as an order is a power. He brings things to pass.

---

[1] Whitehead claims that God as order of possibility is also efficacious.

How pervasive and dominant throughout the whole process of existence may be this order constituting value we cannot here say. But it is far more extensive than any personality is or could be.

God is the personality-producing process of the universe, to use the expression of Shailer Mathews. But he is not himself a personality. God sustains and develops personality because God is that ordered process which generates the greatest possible value; and personalities seem to be indispensable components of the greatest values. But personality is not the goal or end of this order which is God. Rather, personality seems to be a necessary incident in the actualization of highest values.

It will be pointed out that we have occasionally referred to God as "he" and "him" and "himself." Why use the personal pronoun if God is not a personality? Our reply is that we do not always use the personal pronoun. We often use the word "it." But the reason we do sometimes use the personal pronoun is because "it" suggests something less than personality, such as sticks and stones. To use a word which suggests error, is to deceive. Thus "it" applied to God becomes deceptive. But so also the personal pronoun is likewise deceptive. What word, then, shall we use? Let him who can solve that problem cast the first stone. That order which is God demands such a different state of existence than the one in which we now live that our very language needs to be changed. As a matter of fact, it is constantly being changed.

We first refer to God as an order and then as a process. Is there not an inconsistency there? No. Every order of existence is the order of some process and every process which can be described is the exemplification of some order. A process which was not also an order would be chaos. God is an order which is partially exemplified in the present process of existence. But most orders require much more than the present momentary state of existence to exemplify them. That order which constitutes a score of music, for example, requires several minutes to be embodied in existence. The order which constitutes a personality requires more time. A political order may require several centuries to work itself out in existence. That order of value which we call God may require much longer. Hence we cannot find God merely by looking at the present state of existence. The past and present must be observed and the future must be anticipated. As a matter of fact, this is what all scientific investigation does.

PRAYER

Is it possible to pray to God if he is of the sort we have indicated? That depends on what one means by prayer. If by prayer I mean the power of words to persuade God to do things, then prayer is futile and foolish. But if by prayer I mean the power of a certain attitude of the personality to so affect that order of interconnected physical conditions, biological organisms, and communicating personalities which yields the greatest values so that things happen for the good which would not otherwise occur, then prayer is efficacious and very important. Prayer does not consist primarily in movements of the larynx and vibrations of the air. It consists in a certain disposition of the personality. Any attitude or disposition of the personality is prayer if it is deliberately directed to that order which is God to the end of bringing about some good thing. Deliberately to readjust the attitudes of the personality so that they may better fit into the order of God and thus bring about some desired and beneficent result, generally requires the use of words, that is, movements of the larynx and vibrations of the air. But these latter do not constitute the prayer. They could occur without any prayer at all. One might utter the words of the most devout prayer that was ever breathed and yet not be praying at all. It is the attitude of the personality which is the prayer, and not the words.

With this understanding of the nature of prayer the whole question of the power of prayer to bring about observable results in the objective world boils down to this: Does an attitude of the personality deliberately established to meet the requirements of that order which is God have power to make the objective observable world different? Our reply is: It certainly does. Anyone can try it and observe the consequences. For example, I find myself working with a group of men at the office. At some time of solitary worshipful meditation I consider that group in its bearings upon that order of the world which makes for greatest values. Then I examine my own attitudes toward them and toward the order of physical conditions, biological organisms, and communicating personalities which is God. I see where some attitude of mine can be improved. I use words to express and establish this improved attitude toward the group as factors in the total order of value which is God. The words are incidental. The prayer is in the attitude. Perhaps the attitude is one of meekness, sympathy, and good will toward the order of God as it enters into this group. If my attitude is the needed attitude, I shall be able to observe a change in that group and in the whole appearance of the office. The order of God will become more potent and pervasive in that office. By order of God we mean the order of community which leads to the highest values. Thus God answers my prayer. Prayer is efficacious. The objective world in some definite and observable way is changed for the good by the intervention of God. The intervention of God means the fuller entry into our present existence of that order of community which leads to the greatest values.

Consider another example. Suppose I am in ill health. There is an ordered process which heals and builds up the organism, which knits the bones and cleanses the tissues and makes for health. This biological process must not be identified with God. But when this biological process is so related to physical conditions and communicating personalities as to sustain and promote the greatest possible values, this interrelationship is the order which is God. Therefore, the biological process of health under certain conditions and in certain connections with many other factors does enter in to make up that order which is God. In ill health, then, one may retire for prayer and seek out that order of interrelationship between biological process of the organism, the needs of other personalities, the important tasks to be done and, in short, endeavor to grasp as well as he can what are the requirements of the order of greatest value. Then he can seek to establish in himself that attitude which, so far as may be, will meet those requirements. Sometimes these requirements may demand a sacrifice of health. Or, again, one may not be able to get any adequate notion of what may be the requirements of the order of greatest value in the complex situation in which he is placed. If he comes to that conclusion after earnest search and thought, he will simply yield himself to that order in an attitude of complete devotion, not knowing what its requirements are, and will do something experimentally, the best he knows. But that attitude of devotion will be his prayer, and it will lead him on to search and act, with poise and indestructible courage. Searching out the way of life in such an attitude has observable results, and those results are of very marked value, even when health fails and death ensues. The world is made better by such prayer. On the other hand, however, one is far more likely to find the way to meet the requirements of health in such an attitude than in any other.

Prayer consists in the deliberate outreach of my personality after that order of value which is God. It does not consist in the words that I vocalize. If this outreach achieves better personal adjustment to the order of God, things will begin to happen for the good as they did not and could not as long as my attitude did not meet the requirements of this order. Therefore prayer is not only efficacious, but supremely important if God be of the character we have represented him to be.

If a man is intelligent and correctly informed, there is nothing that can arouse in him such passionate searching as the endeavor to find and fit his personality into this order in the process of the world which leads to the greatest values. This searching and this finding is religion.

But this order of God is like the fire that burns and the torrent that destroys. For its fuller entry into our existence will necessitate the destruction of our present way of life with the institutions, ideals, cravings, satisfactions and beliefs that sustain it. We can find our way to the higher order only through the flames of destruction and transformation.

The present status of human existence must be destroyed, and it surely will be. Either its destruction will be the fuller entry into existence of that order which yields the greatest possible value through communication or else it will mark the relapse of human existence to the plane of animal living where mutual adaptation of organic responses without community of mind is the dominant goal of endeavor. There must be decision one way or the other.

There is zest and joy in striving to satisfy the cravings of the organism without regard to anything else. There is zest and joy, however bloody may be the way. Also there is zest and joy in striving to satisfy the needs of personality through communication and the boundless extension of community. But there can be no zest and joy when we strive to do both in such a way that each blocks the other. The way of the beast and the way of personality both sustain a drive of life which will not flag nor fail. Suicide will not be practiced if life be given over completely to either. But suicide, despair, and boredom haunt the life that will not give itself in complete abandon to one or the other. The duality that stultifies all passion and compulsive lure because it will not choose and be made over into the single nature that is chosen, is the way of death.

In this No Man's Land where we now dwell, which is neither beast nor personality, neither efficient organic adaptation nor profound mutual understanding, neither lust untrammeled nor love abounding, neither ruthless fulfillment of organic need nor unbounded extension of community, in such a state pessimism, cynicism, ennui, fatigue, and discouragement are bound to mount like an ash heap higher and higher while the little blaze we call life will sink to an ember. We must decide between these two ways of life and dedicate ourselves irrevocably to one or the other, no matter what the cost. Otherwise neither the joy of life which the beasts possess nor the joy of unrestrained community through communication can be ours.

Destruction of our present order (or disorder) is inevitable. It is only a question of what the destruction will bring forth. Will it bring to dominance the order of the biological organism, subordinating everything to organic adaptation, or will it bring to dominance the order of personality, subordinating everything to communication and community? It must be one or the other. The present duality of orders, striving to keep both dominant, may continue for a few thousand years. But eventually one or the other must prevail, one or the other be made subordinate. This is one of the supreme issues of life both for each individual and for the race. We must decide for community, communication, and personality or else for that mutual organic adaptation displayed by the ants and bees which satisfies all biological craving, but excludes that kind of communication which distinguishes personality. For us there can be no middle ground between these two alternatives. In our present state we are vacillating between the two. But this vacillation cannot continue. We must go one way or the other. And either way we go will require a reconstruction of our existence so radical that it will rend and crush unless it is very, very slow.

Prayer at its best is the deliberate establishment of those attitudes of personality through which the order of God can possess the world. It produces objective and observable consequences which can be noted.

CHAPTER IX

THE LAST DEVOTION

In examining the process of growing up as we did in the first chapter we saw that it involves three phases, the third of which is to pass from the lure of established ideals and convictions to the lure of unexplored possibilities. This third state many people never reach, and it has not been so insistently demanded in the past as it is to-day. For many this devotion to unexplored possibilities of value is pure nonsense.

We seem to be entering a period in the world's history when this third stage of maturity will be demanded more insistently than ever before of everyone who will master the art of living. The reason for this may be that humanity itself is becoming more mature and hence the maturity of the individual must go to higher levels. Perhaps this stage through which the world's life is passing corresponds to adolescence. Heretofore humanity has been in its infancy. It was not fully self-conscious. It was not aware of its own uniqueness as over against the lower animals. It had not discerned the distinctive functions of its own way of life. It lived differently from the lower animals without clearly recognizing wherein that difference lay. But now it is becoming self-conscious. It is beginning to distinguish this new way of life which it has brought into existence and which marks out its unique function in the cosmic totality of things. Perhaps in time it will settle down to concentrate and dedicate all its powers to the fulfillment of this function. Then it will be truly and fully mature. But in any case, however that may be, the present state of the world's existence is forcing upon men more extensively and insistently than ever before a certain unique way of life. Let us note some of the general features which characterize this changing life of modern man.

First, it should be observed that the age of fixed and certain belief is passing. It will not soon come again. It may never come again. There is much to indicate that the tentative, experimental attitude toward every belief and project will spread farther and farther throughout the whole range of human living. There are even now not a few sophisticated and disillusioned individuals who assume as a matter of course that all beliefs must be held in this tentative manner, and every project undertaken must be subject to modification, subject even to discarding, in the light of further evidence. The world is changing and all our beliefs must change, they say. What seems to be most indubitable fact to-day, they declare, may tomorrow reveal itself to be a mirage or, at any rate, very different from what we now think it to be. Therefore no belief is altogether secure.

That, we say, is the attitude of some of the most sophisticated people of our time. It is not yet, we believe, the attitude of the great majority. This majority, no doubt, still have an inner core of belief which they think is fixed and certain forever. They may admit that these central beliefs may be modified in some way, but in the main they are true and in substance can never be doubted. But they find more and more of their peripheral beliefs becoming tentative and insecure. Farther and farther inward toward that central core of fixed and changeless belief is creeping this "disease" of experimental tentativeness, infecting more and more of their beliefs. It would seem that it is only a matter of time when this spreading instability and flux will eat its way into the last stronghold of certainty.

If it is true that all beliefs are bound to become uncertain—and even this belief that they are bound to become uncertain is itself an uncertain belief—if such is the case, a serious question arises: Is it possible to accept anything as object of supreme devotion if we cannot be absolutely sure about anything? Can we dedicate ourselves without reservation, with complete abandon, to any cause, if we cannot be sure that our belief concerning its worthiness is not mistaken? And if we cannot accept anything as object of supreme devotion, is high and noble living possible? Can there be magnificence where there is no sovereign loyalty? Will not the zest and joy of life pass when every enthusiasm is haunted by the specter of doubt? Will not the thrust and drive of passionate striving grow weak and fail? Will not every love and loyalty be sickened with the disease of distrust? Will not there be a baneful ebbing of the surge and flood of life when all belief is sicklied o'er with such a pale caste? We have Joseph Wood Krutch, in his *Modern Temper,* to testify that such must be the outcome.

Our reply is that such inevitably must be the outcome of this spreading tentativeness and experimental attitude toward every project unless the last stage of maturity is reached and life is yielded to the last devotion. Unless men can find some compulsive lure engendering passion on beyond every specific belief and definite program of action, we have reached the end of the human trail. But there is such a lure on beyond, and not a few men have found it, even though many think it is nothing but nonsense because they have not yet reached that stage of maturity. It is the lure of undiscovered possibilities of value.

The life of man upon this planet is young. He has scarcely begun his career. He is not yet beyond his infancy. This new way of life which is an art rather than an urge, and which requires the exploratory transformation of desire rather than the simple striving to fulfill present desire, and which releases imagination through the use of free symbols so that remote possibilities of the future and ancient heritage from the past can be integrated with present experience to lend a grandeur to the passing moment—this new way of life, we say, has not yet been explored. We are scarcely aware that we have entered into it or what it is that has come upon us—we who so recently were bound slavishly to the urge of the present desire and to the immediate situation, as are all the lower animals to-day. Scarcely the gray dawn of this new kind of life is now upon us. There is the lure of unexplored possibilities if we can catch it and yield ourselves to it and make *it* the inspiration of our lives and put it in the place of these crude and shabby beliefs and ideals which this animal that would be man has thus far been able to fabricate.

The prevalent tentative attitude of mind toward all specific ideals and beliefs, and the consequent necessity of passing on to the last devotion in order to have the driving propulsion which all masterful living requires, can be further exemplified by noting a further characteristic of our time.

The present age is distinguished from every other by the dominance of science, machinery and industry. These three have transformed the state of human existence more swiftly and radically, perhaps, than it was ever before transformed in so short a length of time. Now, when the state of existence is radically changed, especially when the change includes a great modification in the habits of human behavior, something more is changed besides the state of existence. Possibilities are also changed. What was once possible is so no longer. And new possibilities arise. These new possibilities are there to be actualized or avoided whether we discern them or not. We may know nothing about them. We may not discover that the old have passed and the new arisen.

But when old possibilities pass and new ones arise, something happens to our ideals. An ideal as we are now considering it is our idea of some possibility of value which is worth striving for. But when possibilities change without us knowing that they change, our ideas of the most worthful possibilities remain the same because we do not know that what was once possible is so no longer; and we do not know that other possibilities of value have arisen, which may be even greater than the old possibilities. Thus it comes about that when the state of existence changes swiftly and radically, producing a like change in the possibilities of value, our ideals are likely to be maladjusted to the new situation. They fail to represent the genuine possibilities of value which the new situation presents. They represent the possibilities of value for which we rightly strove in a different state of existence, but which are no longer the values of this new and radically different situation.

This lag in the transformation of our ideals, which makes the socially accepted ideals of our time unfitted to guide, illumine, and inspire our living, is further evidence that we in our present state of existence must look beyond these socially accepted ideals to the unexplored possibilities of value which have arisen with our new state of existence. Clinging to these outworn ideals and making them supreme over life simply adds to the confusion. It indicates a failure to grow up completely to the requirements of our time.

It is perfectly right and proper to have specific ideals. We must have them. They are indispensable to the conduct of life. The question at issue is not whether we shall have ideals or shall not have ideals. On the contrary, the question is whether our ideals shall be accepted as conclusive, final, and absolute or whether they shall be held subject to correction, transformation, and even discarding for the sake of other ideals when evidence points that way. If old possibilities have passed and new possibilities have emerged, then it is exceedingly important that we discover these new possibilities of great value and do not cling to the old ideals which block the way to their discovery, as, for example, a certain kind of prevalent patriotism certainly does.

Since we cannot know what the unknown possibilities of great value may be, what use is there in recognizing that there are such possibilities? If we do not know them and so cannot make any use of them, why give our devotion to them? The answer is, We cannot search and cannot bring to light unknown possibilities of value unless we believe there are such possibilities to be sought and found. If we do not give our devotion to unknown possibilities, we cannot make those observations and criticisms and experimental ventures which are necessary to discover them. We will not have that open and receptive mind to recognize them when they become manifest if our supreme devotion is given to the old and established ideals.

We must have some passionate devotion to give us the necessary drive of life. If that passionate devotion is given to established and accepted ideals, we cannot seek and find the new possibilities that arise with changing conditions. Where, then, shall we find an object of passionate devotion? Such an object is that order of value which enters into our present state of existence, but which also includes the highest possibilities of value however unknown and undefined by us as yet. Without such a devotion, we maintain, maturity is not attained, the art of living is not mastered, and the way is blocked that leads to the good life in our present age of science, machinery, and industry when all things are changing so rapidly.

Possibilities taken in the abstract are eternal and changeless. They are eternal verities. But the possibility that can be realized under one set of conditions cannot be realized under another set. And the possibility that would be good in one situation would not be good in another. If we make an ideal sufficiently abstract so that it does not give us any specific guidance for our conduct, then we can hold it unchanged, and it is always true. Such, for example, are the ideals of the good, the true, and the beautiful. But as soon as we specify what is the good or the true or the beautiful, then our specification must be different for different states of the world's existence. What is true of one situation is not true of another. What would be beautiful in one state of affairs is not in another. The act which would be morally good under one set of relations would not be in another. Therefore, just as soon as an ideal becomes sufficiently specific to give any direction at all to our way of living, it becomes something which must change when the state of existence changes. Our state of existence has changed most fully under the influence of modern machinery, science, and industry. Therefore our ideals, in so far as they specify what we shall think, say, do, feel, must also change.

The world has changed so rapidly and we have been so absorbed in mastering the technique of the new science, the new machinery, and the new industry, that our ideals have not kept pace.

Even where they have undergone change, what has taken their place has been not so much other ideals as uncertainties and perplexities. And where new ideals have arisen they conflict, being upheld by warring groups, instead of being the guiding lights of the age. In so far as ideals are dominant and widely accepted they generally represent the possibilities that pertained to a very different kind of world—the world of a bygone age. Presumably our modern world has possibilities of great value, just as most other periods in the world's history. Perhaps it has even greater possibilities of value. Our magnified power of control would suggest that. But these possibilities we miss, they slip through our fingers, as long as we are unable to search them out.

Thus we stand confused, with more power at our command to achieve possibilities of value than any people ever had, but without a guiding vision of the possibilities we should strive to bring into existence. So we follow various courses. Some ardently pursue the old ideals, quite unconscious of the fact that these traditional lights are irrelevant to our time and hence yield only a sentimental satisfaction without adequate control of conduct. Others serve new ideals which are the products of speculation rather than observation and experimentation. But such ideals cannot guide us or unify us. Still others turn back to the glamorous past and let their minds dwell upon "the olden golden glory of days gone by," even seeming to hope that this old time might come back again. Others cultivate a refined æstheticism in which they cherish the beliefs, myths, and ideals handed down from the past not as truths, but as lovely illusions which serve to shut away the sordid world. Others plunge into the gaieties of the hour, glad for the moment to be free of all ideals and all thought of anything whatsoever beyond the transitory excitement of the fleeting present. Still others, who might have been our leaders, the most intelligent and sensitive of all, draw aside disillusioned, cynical, pessimistic.

But this age has its possibilities of value, as rich and high, perhaps, as any time in the history of the world. How can we find them? What must we do to bring them to light? There are two things we must do, or, rather, there are two things which must be combined into one. We must have, in the first place, a driving propulsion, a zest and a passion, which will enable us to undertake and carry through the laborious search by which these possibilities can be brought to light and established as specific objectives of human endeavor. But such a search requires such earnest examination, such relentless criticism, and experimentation which is often so dangerous, with destruction of much we so fondly love, that we cannot undertake it or bring it to completion unless we know a lure that awakens within us a passionate seeking. Where can we find such a lure? It cannot be in any specific, established, and accepted ideal or system of ideals, for reasons already mentioned. Neither can it be found in those remote and bloodless abstractions which are eternally true and changeless, but specify nothing, such as the abstract notion of the good, the true, and the beautiful. Where, then, can it be found?

It must be found in that total order of value, veiled, but dimly discerned, which includes the highest possibilities of value that ever can be brought into concrete and specific existence, but which are as yet unknown. This order which operates in our present state of existence, but which includes in the form of possibility whatever unknown possibilities of higher value may ever be brought into existence, this order of existence and possibility, which is by no means the total order of nature or the total cosmic order, but which is one order of nature and one cosmic order—this order thus operative in the present and carrying utmost possibilities of value, can well be identified with God. This is the order which has the lure and can awaken the passionate quest in anyone who is sufficiently mature to give himself to the last devotion. This is the religious way of living when religion assumes the form in which it is "invincible."

We said two things must be combined if the highest possibilities of value which this age of science, machinery, and industry may provide, are to be made accessible to human experience. The first of these two we have just described. The second is a negative requirement. It is simply the obverse of the first. It is the requirement that we cease to give our supreme allegiance to any known and accepted ideal or any system of such ideals or to any set of convictions which assume to specify just what the nature of existence and possibility may be.

We do not mean to deny the value of these ideals, beliefs, and programs of action handed down from the past. We could do nothing without them. They are indispensable tools in our search. We must "stand upon the proffered shoulders of the past" if we would get anywhere or do anything. We cannot set out to search for unknown possibilities of value blindly, without guidance, and without plan of any sort. On the contrary, we have our socially accepted ideals and we must use them. We have our beliefs, our techniques, our programs and we must make them our guides and torches. We must live in the light of them. Structures and projects of life which the past has handed down to us we must use in this way.

But there are two ways in which we can deal with these socially accepted ideals, these achieved structures of value and known possibilities. We can live with them as though they were final, as though they were the supreme good, as though there were nothing on beyond them to seek and explore, or we can use them not as final goods, not as our home and resting place, but as merely torches and trails, leading on. In other words, there are two ways of life according to what we make supreme. We may give our highest allegiance to the socially accepted ideals, the known possibilities, the goods achieved, while the unknown possibilities are for us mere nebulosity and dreamland. Or, on the other hand, we may give our supreme loyalty to this realm of meanings yet to be achieved, these possible structures of value not yet defined and mastered, while the known possibilities and socially accepted ideals are for us mere tools and instruments to be used in this higher devotion. This is the contrast between religion forever on the defensive and in peril and religion invincible.

We have suggested that this attitude of responsiveness to undiscovered possibilities of value is a form of religion. It is a kind of mysticism. As a matter of fact, religion has always cultivated this attitude more or less. But all too frequently it has stopped with the mere emotional response to the fact that there are hidden possibilities of value which eye hath not seen nor ear heard, neither have they entered into the heart of man. All too frequently it has refused to undertake the experimental ventures, analyses, and criticisms through which alone these possibilities can be made available for practical living. This refusal is a perversion of religion. Also, to be blind to the savage cruelty of the world is just as disastrous as to be unresponsive to its hidden values. The practice of religious mysticism has often been used to induce this mood of Pollyanna. But that also is a perversion of religion.

High religion is the cultivation of an attitude which issues in the passionate search for the utmost possibilities of value which the present state of existence may yield. To arouse such an attitude and inspire such a search is the supreme function of religion to-day. It alone can deliver us from the present bafflement and stultifying confusion and cynicism and triviality which haunt the minds of many of the most intelligent. These intelligent and prosperous people have comfort and knowledge and skill and the resources and instruments of achievement, but they lack the lure that can lead them on. They see the inadequacy of all the old ideals, but none other ideals are available. The way of life and deliverance for them, we say, lies in this mystic devotion to that order of existence and possibility which mediates and includes all the undiscovered possibilities of utmost value which our present world affords. This order is God.

The persistent and costly search for unknown and unspecified possibilities by the method of observation, experimentation, analysis, and criticism can scarcely occur unless these possibilities, prior to their discovery, can exercise a compulsive lure. To make known this lure and to make people feel it, is the great gospel and mission of invincible religion in the world to-day.

What are some of the attitudes and conditions which prevent people from feeling this lure and hence must be corrected before this search can be undertaken with any hope of success? There are six of these hindrances which block the way of high religion. There may be others, but these six we shall mention.

The first of these is the rapidity of the change which has been brought about through science, machinery, and industry. This change has been so swift and so revolutionary that it has made it impossible for many people to see that their cherished ideals no longer serve the purpose they once may have served. We have already noted this in the case of nationalistic patriotism. The same applies to many ideals of home and love. The ideal of brotherhood, for example, which expresses itself in charity, is no longer an ideal adequate for dealing with present economic evils. The feudalistic ideal of loyalty in big industrial organizations is outworn and unfitted to our times. And so with many others that might be mentioned. But the change has been so rapid that many have not discovered this maladjustment of their ideals.

A second attitude that must be corrected is absorption in the æsthetic appreciation of old illusions. There are an increasing number of people to-day with fine sensibilities and high intelligence who see that the old ideals and beliefs do not fit our time, but they cherish them for the sake of their tender beauty. They are so devoted to the loveliness of old traditional beliefs and are so insistent on preserving their æsthetic value that they resent any effort to reinterpret and reconstruct such ideals and beliefs in a way that will make them serviceable to our time. They have nothing but scorn and hate for anyone who would put the hand of utility upon this sacred heritage of beauty. It is a sacrilege, they cry, to use these ideals and beliefs as tools for searching out unknown possibilities of value and thus transforming them into something different from their ancient loveliness.

This æstheticism is deadly. It is suicide. Yet many sophisticated and literary people today are doing all in their power to preserve ancient religious beliefs and ideals as you would preserve fine works of art in a museum, for æsthetic enjoyment alone. Hence they are ready to support the Roman Catholic Church because it does not disturb the ancient form of these beliefs. But they fight the modernist in religion or anyone else who would try to change that which seems to them so beautiful. They are having considerable influence in the world to-day for they belong to the comfortable and well-educated intelligentsia. Indeed, no one save a well-fed person whose desire for social prestige and other urgent wants are satisfied, could ever take this attitude toward the beliefs and ideals which at the time they were brought into being were the desperate ventures and mighty strivings of men for the breath of a larger life. These sophisticated and æsthetic intelligentsia are, perhaps, among the greatest evils in the world at the present time, and their baleful influence must be fought as we fight a pestilence. They would make our religious heritage a pleasant work of art for the dalliance of an hour, an added ornament to the luxuries of life. They represent the creeping dry-rot of decadence.

A further obstacle to the great search for the highest possibilities of value which science and machinery may yield is presented by a group which are just the opposite to the refined and conservative æsthetes just mentioned. They are intensely earnest and are working with all their might to achieve the good life for all men in a practical way. But they have no use for undiscovered possibilities of value. "Here," they say, "are the goods we want. We know what we want. All men know what they want. Let us apply our techniques to get it." They have some very specific and practical ideal. It may be Marxian socialism. It may be prohibition. It may be some other economic or political reform. But they will not search. They claim they have already found. What we want is action, they say. Do something. Get something done. All this tentativeness, mysticism, exploration of hidden possibilities of value is nonsense and moonshine.

Still another attitude that is obstructive is found in many specialists and those who are influenced by them. These experts in pure or applied science are so absorbed in their new technique and in their very specialized kind of achievement that they are blind to any larger problems. They cannot see that anything else is needed except to further their special kind of research or other work. A great many who are not experts are so fascinated by some new technique, be it radio or aviation or what not, that they have no time or thought or feeling for anything else. The inclusive problem of human living passes them by. They are so narrowly focused on a special interest that the major issues of life lie beyond their vision and concern.

There is a fifth obstacle to the way of deliverance, and it is perhaps more important, more pernicious and deep rooted than any we have thus far mentioned. It is the lure of wealth made accessible to great numbers by modern science, machinery, and industry. Not everyone can have wealth in our modern world. There is dire need enough. But the opportunity is here as it never was before. He who makes the pursuit of wealth the chief endeavor of his life can often get it in enormous quantities such as was never dreamed before this century. This is due to the control of nature which science and machinery have given us, with the consequent complexity of the economic system which rolls into the pockets of anyone who is strategically situated a river of wealth without, necessarily, any great effort on his part, although the individual who gets it is very likely to credit it to his unique abilities. Certainly, many others will so credit him and will give him high acclaim in consequence.

Wealth is rightly judged to be the means for attaining almost every good thing in life *provided* (1) we know what these possible good things are, and (2) know how to use our wealth, and (3) how to produce our wealth so as to achieve them. But these three kinds of knowledge, or, rather, these two arts directed by this kind of knowledge, are precisely what our age lacks, as we have been trying to demonstrate through this chapter. We do not know what are those possibilities of value at which to aim by the use of our wealth and by the control of the process of economic production. It is just these possibilities which, we say, must be sought and found and which cannot be sought and found unless we make them objects of our devotion. But the lure of great wealth is what to-day is making many people wholly unresponsive to the lure of undiscovered possibilities of value. It turns them away from that search which is high religion and keeps them from ever attaining that maturity which is found in the last devotion.

Here, then, is our present situation. On the one side the world is suddenly transformed by science and machinery so that almost everyone in the middle class as well as the aristocracy—if there is one—is justified in thinking that he has at least a chance for wealth. Great numbers actually win it in sufficient quantity to demonstrate that almost anybody can if he is lucky enough to place himself where the funnels empty their golden stream. On the other side is a set of ideals which are thought to be sufficient to guide us in the use of wealth and in the production of it, but are not. The wealth produced under the control of these ideals makes us think the ideals are right and good. The ideals make us think the wealth is produced and used in the best way. This combination is what prevents us from recognizing that there may be possibilities constituting values far superior to anything we now endeavor to achieve; and it prevents us from making those observations and experiments which would bring such possibilities to light. Any such experiments would interfere with the chief end of life, which is to produce wealth.

As long as men think their traditional ideals represent the genuine possibilities of value in the world to-day, and that all they need is the wealth to bring them to pass, and as long as the chance to make wealth continues to offer itself, men are likely to be blind to the values which might be theirs through the proper use of machinery and scientific control. They will continue to hurl themselves into the effort to make money, doing so for the sake of their ideals of "service," or whatever they may call them, and so fail to discover what truly are the possibilities of value. If the chances to make wealth were not so abundant and the whole of life were not so shackled to the industrial order, we might pause to reconsider our ideals. Or if we were not so cocksure about our ideals, we might pause to reconsider our industrial system. But with greater wealth always just around the corner, and with ideals which are generally considered quite adequate, requiring only to be more strictly enforced, we do not pause to settle such metaphysical questions. (We call such questions "metaphysical" in this "practical" age.) We think we know what we want. All we lack is the means to get it. Wealth is the means and wealth is just ahead. So on with the game. The technique, the machinery, the wealth—these alone are the important questions. Our ideals we already have. So let us not stop to talk about unknown possibilities of value when the golden store is almost in our reach.

Thus wealth has made us blind. So it comes about that instead of wealth serving life, life serves wealth to no great end at all. Meanwhile wealth and power mount higher and higher while the crowd goes milling round and round and the more sensitive individuals who might have been our prophets and leaders draw aside in perplexity and cynicism.

What we have just stated may perhaps be somewhat of a caricature. Some values are realized in our time. Great numbers have comforts that no people ever had before. Furthermore, there is a quickening and widening interest in and enjoyment of science, art, and philosophy. These comforts and these ornaments of life are being multiplied and our capacity to appreciate them is being cultivated. But there are greater values of life than mere comforts and ornaments. And surely anyone who is critical and observant of the modern situation must detect that there is a peculiar confusion and bafflement with respect to the high ends of endeavor. Life has not the reach and magnificence that it might have and that it has had at certain times in the past, and which it would have if we undertook the great quest of high religion.

There is a sixth trait of our life which makes us unresponsive to high possibilities of value yet to be discovered and so prevents us from searching for them. It is the glorification of human desires as the chief guides to value. Instead of recognizing an objective order of possibility and existence as constituting value, the satisfaction of our desires and the realization of our ideals are held to constitute all the value there is and all the value there ever can be. This is one kind of humanism.

This glorification of our desires and ideals brings us to consideration of what we shall call the vicious circle of disillusionment. Disillusionment, understood literally, is an escape from illusion, and that is one of the best things which can happen to a man. But we are thinking of something more than that. We are thinking of that state of mind which ensues when a man has once experienced satisfaction of his desires and has achieved his ideals in so far as there is any possibility of achieving them, and has discovered how small and worthless that experience is, and yet believes that the sole guide to any value whatsoever consists in satisfaction of his desires and achievement of his ideals. After having once experienced this satisfaction and this achievement such a man is unable to believe in any values worth seeking. So he enters the vicious circle of disillusionment.

If the facts are to be clearly discerned and the highest function of life is not to be lost in a blur of confusion, it is very important that we see that the supreme object of devotion must not be human ideals and the chief goal of life must not be to satisfy human desires. A human ideal, in the sense we are now considering it, is a human idea of what the value in any possible situation may be. If human ideas were infallible, then human ideals might be made the supreme objects of devotion. But human ideals are not infallible. Human ideals are exceedingly important. Human hopes and dreams are very important. But they are merely groping, searching headlights by which we seek to discover just what those possible structures of existence may be which constitute value. To assume that our ideals are identical with such structures is the height of folly. It is one of the extreme examples of wishful thinking.

So also with human desires. We desire all sorts of things. But to satisfy desire is by no means invariably and infallibly to attain the greatest values or even very mediocre values. Some desires when satisfied yield great values. Other desires when satisfied yield only trivial values. If a man does not have the right kind of desires, then satisfaction of his desires will never yield value of any importance or magnitude. Any man who assumes that all he needs to attain the great values is to satisfy his desires is suffering from a very dangerous kind of immaturity. The first requirement is to have our desires transformed into that kind of desire which can enter into an experience of the great values. This transformation is, doubtless, a continuous re-education of our desires, a reinterpretation of our wants and a reconstruction of our total personalities.

It is the mistake of some to talk as though our ideals were the supreme objects of devotion.

Ideals are important factors, to be sure, along with biological organisms, although the biological organism is more important than the ideal. But the chief function of an ideal is to guide us in experimental ventures by which we search out those mutual adjustments of organisms, meanings and physical conditions which constitute greatest value. As soon as the ideal is set up as most important, it becomes an obstacle to the experimental search for that order which constitutes greatest value. Ideals are tools, that is all. They are means, not ends. They must be held subject to the order of value. He who tries to make the order of value subject to ideals, is hindering and crippling human life in fulfilling its supreme function. As soon as anyone tries to make the order of value in the image of his own ideal, rather than using his ideal to explore the order of value, he is making a disastrous blunder. His idealism becomes one of the chief obstacles to progress. We can see this plainly enough in the hopes and dreams of the man we oppose—for example, the hope and dream of a grand and glorious war in which the United States will conquer the world. But it is probable that our own ideals are somewhat less than perfect and need examination and reconstruction.

The great issue is this: Shall we try to use the order of value as an instrument to achieve our ideals or shall we use our ideals as instruments to achieve the order of value? Plainly, it is nothing but intellectual confusion that could ever lead us deliberately to subordinate the order of value to our ideals, making our ideals supreme. But the sad fact is that such intellectual confusion is widespread and thick as a London fog. The culmination of man's quest through the ages, if ever there is a culmination, will not be to build the house of his dreams. It will be to climb above the fog of his dreams and see that the greatest values are shining summits very different from his dreams.

But, someone may object, suppose these undiscovered values are not worth the cost? The answer to that question is that these undiscovered possibilities are the best that is in all the total realm of actual and possible reality. There is nothing to which this best can be compared which can make it seem unworthy or less than infinitely good. It is invaluable because it is the best there is. He who devotes himself to the best there is, since it cannot be compared disparagingly with something better, cannot find it unworthy of his utmost devotion.

Another question may be asked: May not our discovered values be as good as, or better than, the undiscovered? The answer is that the goods we now possess and know, have not been discovered to be the ultimate good until we have demonstrated that they are better than anything else that can ever be achieved. Until we demonstrate that fact, we have not discovered the greatest value, even though when it is discovered it should prove to be what we already have. The supreme value of what we now possess, if it is supreme, is yet to be discovered as constituting the invaluable good. But anyone who is able to discern how new and unexplored is the human way of living, can scarcely think that we have yet reached the highest possibilities of value which this human way may afford. Rather, he will think that we have scarcely begun. The great discoveries, the great achievements, the great values, and the great dangers are still ahead.

There must be wreckage, sorrow, and great suffering before our feet find that trail which leads the farthest and the highest. The experimental operations necessary to construct at the level of richest values a system of control analogous to what we have in physics will be far more costly and painful than anything mankind has thus far voluntarily attempted. The Russian experiment is a hint of it. To undergo great suffering and turn it to profit by making it a medium for discovery requires an enormous zest for life. There are some individuals who have this zest. They are so voracious for life that any amount of suffering, defeat, and loss leaves them undaunted and daring still. They wade through blood, whether it be their own or their foe's or their beloved's. This voraciousness is found at two levels. It is found among lower animals which have great biological vitality. It is also found among some men who are so unreflective and so endowed with abounding vitality that nothing can subdue the animal urge that is in them as long as the heart continues to beat. But this same zest is also found at another level where it is not due to mere biological vitality at all. There it is due to a passion awakened by a lure and not by an urge. Religion which is response to the compulsive lure of God gives such zest at the high level of personality.

When the time comes to the individual or to the race when the old order or disorder becomes impossible and a new order must be won and the price of this transition must be paid, some will commit suicide, some will die of boredom or despair or a broken heart, and some will be destroyed. But if the new way of life is ever achieved, it will be because there are some who have an insatiable appetite for life and so can keep going when every established interest and known good is insufficient to sustain the vital striving. They must have an undying fire which failure, frustration, and disaster cannot quench, nor lack of known objective subdue. People who have this unlimited life-hunger are of two sorts. Some have it because they do not think or, if they think, life for them is not dependent on what they think, hence they live automatically like the excised heart. They are sustained by the animal urge. Others have the undying fire because of their complete dedication to the best there is, however unknown. This mystic devotion to the order of God when still unknown, as in great part it always is unknown, engenders a striving that nothing can daunt.

Why does dedication to the supreme and unknown good engender a striving so invincible? For three reasons. First, because the object of devotion which then inspires the striving is invaluable, being the best there is in all reality actual and possible, and hence worth everything that may be endured or given. Second, because it is not irrevocably identified with any known object or undertaking, these all being more or less tentative and exploratory; hence failure or disaster to any of these does not blot out from life the star of value which leads on. Third, under the dominance of such a devotion all experience becomes a seeking of this highest value, an adoration of it and a reaching after it. Hence all experience becomes a way of experiencing the best there is in all reality. Even failure of any specific enterprise, even pain and all evil, since these along with pleasure and successful fulfillments make up the medium of experience in which we seek for and reach after the supreme good, are ways of experiencing this object of our supreme devotion.

Some may be unable to see how it can be said that we ever experience an unknown good. We experience it as we experience anything for which we seek. All seeking, especially a passionate and all-absorbing quest, is a way of experiencing that for which we seek. When Ben Hur devoted his life to seeking his lost mother and sister, his life became shot through with the experience of them even while they still were lost. When a child is lost or kidnaped and the parent spends the rest of his life seeking for the child, all experience becomes for that parent an experience of the child, not directly, not as though the child were physically present, but as having the significance of possibly leading on to the child. We previously referred to Jacob serving seven years for Rachel. All this experience of seven years of labor took on for Jacob a certain meaning. Its meaning was Rachel. Whenever experience has a meaning, it is the experience of that which is meant. To experience the touch of a hand is to experience the personality who touches me if the touch means to me that personality. So likewise if all experience has for me the meaning of a quest and of a devotion, and if the object of that quest and of that devotion is the supreme good, however otherwise unspecified its nature may be, then experience is for me the experience of that supreme good. When all experience is suggestive of that for which I seek, and when that for which I seek is the supreme good, then all experience has for me the meaning of the supreme good. Then in all things I experience the supreme good. All experience becomes transfused with a light, the light of an invisible sun.

If this is mysticism, so be it. If it is not mysticism, then call it by another name. But whatever we call it, one thing is sure: It is the essence of that heroic religion which has made the men who possessed it inconquerable and blessed through all things.

"The strong men keep coming on." These strong men have the insatiable appetite for life, either because of the animal urge or because of the religious passion. The great question is, Which will it be, the urge or the passion, that leads us through the murk? If it is the urge, we shall become better animals than we now are. If it is the passion, we shall become greater personalities. But if it is neither, if we lack both the urge and the passion, if our intelligence stultifies both, then we shall decline and become less than we are, both as animals and as personalities.

There is a kind of religion which engenders a vital striving that is invincible. It is invincible because it feeds on pain and failure and all manner of trouble with almost as much gusto and nourishment as it finds in comforts and successes. The psychology and the rationality of such a religion are exceedingly difficult to make plain in an age which identifies all value with comforts, pleasures, and successful achievements. Some would classify such religious living with the irrationality of the animal urge. But it is just the opposite. It is life sustained and inspired by that order of unexplored possibilities which constitutes the invaluable object of devotion for all human living.

INDEX

PAGE

Æsthetic experience . . . 121–124
Æstheticism . . . 254
Aspiration . . . 27
Augustine . . . 64

Barthians . . . 176
Beauty . . . 121–124
Belief . . . 239–242
Biochemical . . . 71
Buddha . . . 64
Burtt, Edwin . . . 22

Cather, Willa . . . 130
Christianity . . . 39–41
Christian Century . . . 6
Communication, nature of . . . 43–45
    value of . . . 64–68
Co-operative adjustment . . . 81–85

Death Comes to the Archbishop . . . 130
Dewey, John . . . 18, 22, 24, 142, 143–145
Duality of orders . . . 235–237, 169–176

Edison . . . 77
Empiricism . . . 188–192
Energy . . . 69ff.
Excitement . . . 75

Failure . . . 125–134
Fanaticism . . . 99
Friendship . . . 46–63, 124
Function of Reason . . . 228

Galileo . . . 154
Gandhi . . . 23, 131, 132
George, Lloyd . . . 72
God, and the ideal . . . 163–165
    concept of . . . 178
    use of the word . . . 149–156
    versus personality . . . 220–229
Godless religion . . . 166–168
Goethe . . . 89
Great Society . . . 64–68

PAGE

Habits........78–81
Hapgood, W. P........37
Hays, John........111
Health........103
How We Think........22
Humanism........161, 261–264

Ideal, and possibilities........33, 242–246, 261–264
  definition of........159–161
  two meanings of........157
Illusion........128
Introduction to Logic of Reflective Thinking........22

Jesus........39, 64, 131, 132, 221
Joan of Arc........62

Kant........218
Kingdom of God........221
Knowledge, and experience........188–192
  of God........198
  esoteric........195
  three kinds........199–205
Krutch, Joseph Wood........241

Life-purpose........85–100
Lindsley, Mary........6, 63
Lippmann, Walter........29–35

Marriage........57–63
Mathews, Shailer........229
Maturity........7ff.
McClure........22
Means and End........111–121
Memory........121–125
Michelson........80
Modern Temper........241
Morality........140
Mussolini........72
Mysticism........251–252, 267–269

Napoleon........77
Newton, Isaac........180
North American Review........6

Personality, defined........209
  how developed........210–216
  value of........217–220
  versus God........220–229
Possibilities........12ff., 33, 242–246

PAGE
Prayer....231–234, 237
Preface to Morals.... 29
Principles and Problems of Right Thinking.... 22
Problem-solving....18–28, 101

Quest for Certainty.... 143

Reality.... 189
Relaxation.... 25
Religion, and morality.... 140
    at its best....170–175
    definition of.... 135
    of John Dewey....143–145
    without God....147–156
    and scientific method....205–208
Rest....76–78
Roosevelt, Theodore.... 72
Russian Communism.... 141

Saint Francis.... 64
Scientific method.... 187
    in religion....205–208
Sex....60–63
Skill.... 110
Socrates.... 131
Sperry, Dean.... 168
Spinoza.... 144
Stimulation....73–76, 88
Streeter, Canon.... 189
Suicide....14–16
Symbol....43, 115
    and personality....215–216

Theory.... 181
Tragedy of life....235–237, 169–176
Trinity.... 220

Vision....111–121

Wealth.... 104
    and ideals....257–260
Whitehead, A. N....180n, 228
Worshipful problem-solving....23–28, 101

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01208 3418

Date Due

Mr 8 - 39			
FACULTY			
Mr 2 [illegible] '44			
Jl 24 '45			
Ap [illegible]			
FACULTY			
MR 30 '49			
~~AUG 2 2 '61~~			
~~SEP 5 '61~~			
MAR 1 8 '64			
~~APR [illegible] '64~~			
~~APR [illegible] '64~~			
~~FACULTY~~			
~~[illegible]~~			

Some you have counted worthy of suffering
blessed are they strengthen them by thy presence
O great God come down into our little hearts
may our hungry souls be roused by this service
to God who holds all things
Prayer is as old as smiling & weeping as old as
death we come to thee at all time seeking our Father
the great companion of our souls.
Rockmoninoff's Prelude in G Minor